Between Philology and Theology

Supplements

to the

Journal for the Study of Judaism

Editor

Benjamin G. Wright, III

Department of Religion Studies, Lehigh University

Associate Editors

Florentino García Martínez

Qumran Institute, University of Groningen

Hindy Najman

Department of Religious Studies and Program in Judaic Studies,
Yale University

Advisory Board

G. BOHAK — J.J. COLLINS — J. DUHAIME — P.W. VAN DER HORST —
A.K. PETERSEN — M. POPOVIĆ — J.T.A.G.M. VAN RUITEN —
J. SIEVERS — G. STEMBERGER — E.J.C. TIGCHELAAR —
J. MAGLIANO-TROMP

VOLUME 162

The titles published in this series are listed at brill.com/jsjs

Between Philology and Theology

Contributions to the Study of Ancient Jewish Interpretation

By

Florentino García Martínez

Edited by

Hindy Najman and Eibert Tigchelaar

BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2013

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

García Martínez, Florentino.
[Essays. Selections]
Between philology and theology : contributions to the study of ancient Jewish interpretation / by Florentino Garcia Martinez ; edited by Hindy Najman and Eibert Tigchelaar.
pages ; cm. — (Supplements to the Journal for the study of Judaism, ISSN 1384-2161 ; v. 162)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-90-04-24393-4 (hardback : alk. paper) — ISBN 978-90-04-24394-1 (e-book : alk. paper)
1. Hebrew philology. 2. Bible. O.T.—Criticism, Textual. 3. Dead Sea scrolls. 4. Judaism—Doctrines. I. Najman, Hindy, editor. II. Tigchelaar, Eibert J. C., editor. III. Title.

PJ4515.G37 2013
296.1—dc23

7187302102

This publication has been typeset in the multilingual "Brill" typeface. With over 5,100 characters covering Latin, IPA, Greek, and Cyrillic, this typeface is especially suitable for use in the humanities. For more information, please see www.brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 1384-2161
ISBN 978-90-04-24393-4 (hardback)
ISBN 978-90-04-24394-1 (e-book)

Copyright 2013 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Global Oriental, Hotei Publishing, IDC Publishers and Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments vii
Abbreviations ix
Introduction xiii

A. THEOLOGICAL REFLECTIONS

1. Abraham and the Gods: The Paths to Monotheism in Jewish Religion 3

2. The Foreskins of Angels 17

3. Geography as Theology: From the *Book of Jubilees* to the *Phaleg* by Arias Montano 31

B. DIVINE ENCOUNTERS

4. The Heavenly Tablets in the *Book of Jubilees* 51

5. Balaam in the Dead Sea Scrolls 71

6. Divine Sonship at Qumran and in Philo 83

C. TARGUMIC INTERPRETATIONS

7. Eve's Children in the Targumim 101

8. Sodom and Gomorrah in the Targumim 119

9. Hagar in *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* 135

D. RENAISSANCE RECEPTIONS OF 4 EZRA

10. The Authority of 4 Ezra and the Discovery of America 149

11. The Authority of 4 Ezra and the Jewish Origin of (Native) American Indians 173

Subject Index 191
by Sonja G. Anderson

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The following articles either have been published or are in print, and permission has been requested for republication:

"Abraham y los dioses: Los caminos del monoteísmo en la religión judía." Pages 75–94 in *Religions del Món Antic: Entre politeisme i monoteisme*. Diriget per M. L. Sánchez León. Palma: Universitat de les Illes Balears, 2003. Translated by W. G. E. Watson.

"El prepucio de los ángeles." *Estudios Bíblicos* 66 (2008): 285–300. FS Domingo Muñoz León. Translated by W. G. E. Watson.

"La Geografía como Teología: Del Libro de los Jubileos al Phaleg de Arias Montano." FS Jesús Peláez. Translated by W. G. E. Watson.

"The Heavenly Tablets in the Book of Jubilees." Pages 243–60 in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees.* Edited by M. Albani, J. Frey, and A. Lange. TSAJ 65. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997.

"Balaam in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 71–82 in *Balaam's Prophecy*. Edited by G. H. van Kooten and J. T. A. G. M. van Ruiten. TBN 11. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

"Divine Sonship at Qumran and in Philo." *Studia Philonica* 19 (2007): 85–99.

"Eve's Children in the Targumim." Pages 27–45 in *Eve's Children: The Biblical Stories Retold and Interpreted in Jewish and Christian Traditions*. Edited by G. P. Luttikhuizen. TBN 5. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

"Sodom and Gomorrah in the Targumim." Pages 83–96 in *Sodom's Sin: Genesis 18–19 and its Interpretations*. Edited by E. Noort and E. Tigchelaar. TBN 7. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

"Hagar in Targum Pseudo-Jonathan." Pages 263–274 in *Abraham, the Nations, and the Hagarites.* Edited by M. Goodman, G. H. van Kooten and J. T. A. G. M. van Ruiten. TBN 13. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

"La autoridad de 4 Esdras y el descubrimiento de América." *Estudios Bíblicos* 70 (2012). FS José Manuel Sánchez Caro. Translated by W. G. E. Watson.

"La autoridad de 4 Esdras y el origen judío de los Indios americanos," *Fortunatae. Revista canaria de filología, cultura y humanidades clásicas* 2012. FS Jesús González Luis. Translated by W. G. E. Watson.

The editors thank Sonja G. Anderson (Yale University) and Jeremy M. Penner (KU Leuven) for their assistance.

ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Anchor Bible
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
ALUOS	Annual of Leeds University Oriental Society
AnBib	Analecta biblica
ArBib	The Aramaic Bible
ArSt	*Aramaic Studies*
Aug	*Augustinianum*
BA	La Bible d'Alexandrie
BAC	Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos
BAE	Biblioteca de Autores Españoles
Bib	*Biblica*
BibOr	Biblica et Orientalia
Bijdr	*Bijdragen: Tijdschrift voor filosofie en theologie*
BIS	Biblical Interpretation Series
BJS	Brown Judaic Studies
BMidr	Biblioteca Midrásica
BN	*Biblische Notizen*
BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament
BZ	*Biblische Zeitschrift*
CBET	Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
CBR	*Currents in Biblical Research*
CEJL	Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature
CFJ	Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary
CSEL	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum
CSCO	Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium
CSIC	Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas
CUAPS	Catholic University of America Patristic Studies
DJD	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert
DJDJ	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan
DSD	*Dead Sea Discoveries*
DSSSE	F. García Martínez and E. J. C. Tigchelaar, *Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition.* Leiden: Brill, 1997–98; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2000

DSST	F. García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated.* Leiden: Brill, 1995
ErIsr	*Eretz Israel*
EstBíb	*Estudios bíblicos*
HNT	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
HSS	Harvard Semitic Studies
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
IEB	Introducción al Estudio de la Biblia
JANES	*Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JJS	*Journal of Jewish Studies*
JSHRZ	Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit
JSJ	*Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period*
JSJSup	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series
Jud	*Judaica*
MGWJ	*Monatschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums*
NHS	Nag Hammadi Studies
NTS	*New Testament Studies*
OLP	*Orientalia lovaniensia periodica*
OrAnt	*Oriens antiquus*
OTP	*Old Testament Pseudepigrapha.* Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1983–85
PACS	Philo of Alexandria Commentary Series
PLCL	Philo. 1929–1953. *Works.* Translated by F. H. Colson, G. H. Whitaker, and R. Marcus. 12 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press
PVTG	Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece
RBén	*Revue bénédictine*
RevQ	*Revue de Qumrân*
RHEF	*Revue d'histoire de l'Eglise de France*
RHR	*Revue de l'histoire des religions*
RHPR	*Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses*
RTL	*Revue théologique de Louvain*
SacEr	*Sacris erudiri*
Salm	*Salmanticensis*
SBLEJ	Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and its Literature
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series

SC	Sources chrétiennes. Paris: Cerf, 1941–
Sef	*Sefarad*
Sem	*Semitica*
SJLA	Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity
SSN	Studies Semitica Neerlandica
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
SVTP	Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha
TBN	Themes in Biblical Narrative
TECC	Textos y estudios "Cardenal Cisneros"
TS	Texts and Studies
TSAJ	Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum (Texts and Studies on Ancient Judaism)
TUGAL	Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur
UUÅ	Uppsala Universitetsårskrift
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*

INTRODUCTION

The essays by Florentino García Martínez collected in this volume reflect some of his most recent work on theological concepts as they are formed in the interpretations and in the imagination of ancient Jewish writers. Florentino's deep understanding of the religious imagination in ancient Judaism comes out of his philological, literary, and historical work on ancient Jewish texts from the biblical, Qumranic, Second Temple, targumic and rabbinic corpora. From his earliest publications to his ongoing work, Florentino has given his acute attention to the claims and the insights of ancient Jewish texts, situating them in their ancient contexts, in the histories of their reception, and in their formation. His early studies of rabbinic Judaism provided him with a nuanced and deep understanding of the vitality and mutability of Judaism. As the reader will see, Florentino has brought his sensitivity to this vitality with him into work on other areas of ancient Judaism. Thanks to him, the way scholars of ancient Judaism think about the concept of the divine, angels, liturgy and community formation, as well as numerous other topics and concepts, has been enriched.

* * *

This volume is organized into four sections, each of which engages the ancient Jewish religious imagination, while also embarking on theological reflection.

The first part includes three essays that focus predominantly on readings of Second Temple texts. In each one of these essays Florentino tackles larger theological topics while attending to the details of careful philological interpretation.

In the first essay, "Abraham and the Gods: the Paths to Monotheism in Jewish Religion," Florentino shows the development of concepts of monotheism by considering a broad selection of Second Temple Jewish texts in Hebrew and in Greek. He argues that cultural encounters between Jewish and Greek worlds ultimately created the context for monotheistic theology. Florentino does not impose the concept of monotheism onto ancient Jewish texts but rather indicates where some of the seeds of monotheistic faith tradition emerged, some two thousand years ago.

In the second essay in the first part, "The Foreskins of Angels," Florentino traces numerous ancient Jewish texts that discuss the gender of

angels. In their perfection, angels, if they are gendered at all, are typically circumcised. However, many texts spiritualize angels and do not mention gender. Florentino considers the history of transmission of these texts and also later emendations that appear to omit language of angelic circumcision. This study can help scholars understand how Jews thought about perfection, gender, and the differentiation of angels in antiquity.

In the third and final essay in this section, "Geography as Theology: From the Book of Jubilees to the Phaleg by Arias Montano," Florentino contrasts two ways in which ancient Jewish writers related to biblical geography. Here as in so much of his work, his choice of examples displays an astounding range of knowledge. Florentino shows how some interpreters of biblical texts, exemplifying the first model, used their geographical knowledge to update the biblical account in Genesis 10. Those who deployed the second model, however, did not update geographical names or ethnography. Instead, they used the geographical knowledge of their time to reinterpret the biblical text, thereby transforming geography into theology. Hence a small geographical detail could, under certain conditions, gain enormous importance in the theological formation of interpretive communities.

The second part of this volume highlights theological and interpretive insights from ancient Jewish writers. The first essay focuses on the *Book of Jubilees* and the important role that the heavenly tablets play in the theological formation of the writer's overall goal. Florentino identifies six different categories of laws and divine history that are included under the rubric of "the heavenly tablets." He argues that the heavenly tablets should be understood by analogy to the rabbinic Oral Torah insofar as they present a corrective and updating of the first Torah. Florentino demonstrates that the heavenly tablets underwrite the authority of interpretation in the *Book of Jubilees*. Theological, legal, calendrical, and narrative interpretations are thereby presented not as innovations but as inscribed into a timeless and divinely ordained tradition.

In the second essay in this section, "Balaam in the Dead Sea Scrolls," Florentino asks whether, just as we can see the seeds for the demonization of Balaam in the Greek Bible, we can also see them in the scrolls. The answer is both yes *and* no. Florentino uncovers distinctive treatments of the Balaam pericope, sometimes even within a single text. On one account Balaam is villainized by inclusion in a list of Israel's false prophets. In a second, contrasting interpretation, Balaam is used to illustrate diverse messianic expectations. Reflection upon and use of the Balaam pericope from Numbers provides us with insight both about ancient Jewish interpretation, and about how one understood messianic expectation, as well as the danger of false messiahs and false prophets.

The third and final essay in this section is entitled: "Divine Sonship at Qumran and in Philo." This essay reconceives divine sonship in ancient Judaism. Florentino deftly and elegantly demonstrates the variety of ways in which sonship is depicted throughout the writings of Philo of Alexandria and the Dead Sea Scrolls. The result is a rich and variegated study of sonship which illuminates mediated revelation, intellectual, moral and religious transformation, human imitation of the divine, kingship, the community of Israel, and angelic transformation.

The third part of the volume contains three essays focusing on targumic interpretations that have implications for the religious imagination of ancient Jewish interpreters. Each of the three essays examines early biblical figures from Genesis. The first essay, "Eve's Children in the Targumim," explores the halakic and theological dimensions of Cain's origins, transgression, intention and culpability. Florentino emphasizes throughout the essay that while there are important theological issues at play, debates about these important theological issues are also grounded in careful exegetical work on the part of the targumic writers. Thus, Florentino demonstrates that the philological investigation of the biblical texts is essential for the development of a precise understanding of theological developments in ancient Judaism.

In the second essay in this section, "Sodom and Gomorrah in the Targumim," Florentino creates a fascinating web of targumic and rabbinic interpretation, exploring the force behind the destruction of the two cities, the sins for which the cities and the inhabitants were destroyed, and a particular interpretive tradition concerning a girl named Pelitit. The targumic and midrashic readings are shown to have transformed and enriched the biblical narrative, while purporting to resolve unanswered questions about the terse and suggestive biblical narrative. Throughout these explorations, Florentino shows a deep and sensitive understanding of how philology can shed light on a rich array of theological concepts, such as transgression and destruction, while illuminating the ancient Jewish interpreters' perception of the role that biblical law can play in maintaining law and justice within the city.

The final essay in this section is "Hagar in Targum Pseudo-Jonathan." This essay presents interpretations of Hagar and shows how a number of exceptional and remarkable interpretations are already present in the *Genesis Apocrypon* and Josephus. Florentino makes no anachronistic claims about dependence or unfounded claims about transmission. Rather, he presents the evidence and lays it out clearly for his readership. He shows how texts such as the *Genesis Apocryphon* preserve ancient Jewish traditions that often resurface in texts such as *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan*.

Moreover, *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* preserves a fascinating discourse about the origins of idolatry as linked with Hagar and Egypt, and about Abraham's exemplary attempt to protect his progeny. These interpretations will continue to be developed in ancient Jewish texts and theological discourses in later Jewish interpretations.

The fourth and final part of this book builds on Florentino's earlier work on 4 Ezra,[1] in which he demonstrated the deep connections between 4 Ezra and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Here, however, he looks well beyond the period of ancient Judaism and considers the later impact of 4 Ezra, its reception and application.

In the first of these two essays, entitled "The Authority of 4 Ezra and the Discovery of America," Florentino shows the authoritative role that 4 Ezra played in shaping later theological and interpretative traditions prior to the Reformation. The thorough and detailed tracing of uses of 4 Ezra—both explicit and implicit—is both exemplary and, at the same time, typical of Florentino's scholarship.

In the final essay of this volume, "The Authority of 4 Ezra and the Jewish Origin of (Native) American Indians," Florentino considers the role of 4 Ezra in 16th- and 17th-century debates about the putatively Jewish origins of the American Indians. As usual, he has the imagination and the courage to enter uncharted waters.

* * *

Florentino's vision, sharp mind, and generous spirit have given birth to many projects, books, articles, book series, and journals. We are delighted to be able to publish this volume in our series, which owes its existence and success to Florentino's genius and determination. With the publication of this volume, we celebrate the many contributions of Florentino García Martínez to the study of ancient Judaism.

Hindy Najman, Yale University
Eibert Tigchelaar, KU Leuven

---

[1] Florentino García Martínez, "Traditions communes dans le *IV^e Esdras* et dans les MSS de Qumrân," *RevQ* 15/57–58 (1991): 287–301 (= *Mémorial Jean Starcky. Textes et études qumrâniens I* [ed. É. Puech et F. García Martínez; Paris: Gabalda, 1991]); trans. as "Traditions Common to *4 Ezra* and the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Qumranica Minora I: Qumran Origins and Apocalypticism* (STDJ 63; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 153–67.

"Le *IV^e Esdras* et les MSS de Qumrân," in *RASHI 1040–1990. Hommage à Ephraïm E. Urbach. Congrès européen des Études juives* (ed. G. Sed-Rajna; Patrimoines: Judaïsme; Paris: Cerf, 1993), 81–90.

A. THEOLOGICAL REFLECTIONS

CHAPTER ONE

ABRAHAM AND THE GODS: THE PATHS TO MONOTHEISM IN JEWISH RELIGION

In the historical period which concerns us here, the Greek and Roman periods of Judaea (let us say, from the third century B.C.E. on), monotheism travelled a long way in Israel and had been fixed in the thought of the people as a fundamental fact: There is only one God, and this unique God is our God. Expressed in another way and with the categories of Jewish thought: Yahweh, the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, is the only true God, the absolute principle at the origin of all creation.

I am convinced that this fundamental fact, which is the basis of the three great monotheistic religions we know, Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, had already been completely acquired in the period that concerns me here. This supposes, in the case of Judaism, that the confession of traditional Jewish faith (*Shema Yisrael, Adonay Elohenu Adonay 'eḥad*, which originally simply meant "We have only one God who is Yahweh") had already acquired the meaning of the philosophical principle that there could be only one deity or absolute divine principle, i.e., that both concepts had already merged. In the period under discussion here, this profession of Jewish faith already meant: "Yahweh is the only god."

I suppose that the other lectures which dealt with monotheism in other religions, explained the origins of the idea of the monotheism and the possible (or impossible) influences of the ideas of these religions on the development of monotheism in the religion of Israel, and have set out the chronological framework in which the monotheistic idea developed and was extended in these religions.

I also suppose that in the lecture on monotheism in the Old Testament, the path taken by this idea of the monotheism in the Hebrew Bible was traced: this process of the universalization of the God of the fathers, who became the God of all the people, and ended up being the sole God of the whole universe. Although not all specialists agree, I am convinced that this path had been rather slow and tortuous and was marked by advances and retreats during the history of Israel. It starts with conflicts among gods, goddesses, minor deities and others (iconic or aniconic) of less importance that proliferate at the most ancient levels of the beliefs

of the people of Israel. It then goes through the purifying struggles of the prophets (such as Amos or Jeremiah) against a "hard-necked" people that continues to make *molok* sacrifices in the *tophet* of Jerusalem and the prophets' fight against "syncretism" and the survival of Canaanite gods; it is purified by the Deuteronomistic regulations of the cult in the one sanctuary of Jerusalem and with the birth and later triumph of the "Yahweh alone" movement which definitively imposes "monolatry" in Israel (i.e., worship of a single God by a single community), and culminates in this monument comprising the prophetic oracles ascribed to Second Isaiah which contains the clearest expressions of uniqueness of the God of the Hebrew Bible. This anonymous prophet already combines into one the tribal and *personal* god of Jacob, the God of the prophets, and the institutional God of all the people, and for some specialists even proclaims the unique God of the whole universe.

As I said at the beginning, in the period and in the texts that I am presenting here, the formulation of monotheism properly so called (one specific God, the God of Israel, is the only divine principle, the god of the philosophers) has already been solidly acquired and well rooted. The Jewish texts of the Greek and Roman periods under discussion place us, some more than others, already at the goal and represent the finishing line, not the starting-point, of monotheism within the faith of Israel.

The paths to which the title of my lecture refers and which we are going to travel along together, by rereading some Jewish texts from the Greek and Roman periods, are, so to say, the paths of a crab. They are paths that go backwards, that project back to the beginnings of Israel's faith the convictions current at the time when the texts were written (the Greek and Roman periods) and claim that the understanding of monotheism current at that time was already present at the time of the origins. To make Abraham the "inventor" of monotheism is clearly an anachronism. However, the attempt made by these texts to present the patriarch as the first worshipper of the one true God will help us (at least, this is my hope) to understand the journey we have travelled, and, in passing, perhaps, to identify better the milestones marking this path.

The purpose of my lecture is very simple: to attempt to respond to a question that anyone might ask who is aware of the path taken by the idea of monotheism before implanting itself solidly in Israel. From where did the impulse come that made Jewish religion move from "monolatry" to "monotheism"? To answer this question, I have gone back to reading again these texts that portray Abraham as the inventor of monotheism. This is in order to see whether they will provide us with something that enables

us to explain whether the transformation of "monolatry" into "monotheism" is peculiar to Jewish thought, or whether the emergence of monotheism was due to the desire to reformulate the faith of Israel within the categories imposed by a philosophy of Greek origin, by the philosophical monotheism of the Neo-Platonists, for example.

I have chosen some texts that originated in the Jewish diaspora, written in Greek, and clearly influenced by the thought of the philosophers, and others from the land of Israel and written in Hebrew, in which this influence can be completely excluded. Common to all these texts is that they present Abraham as the inventor of monotheism, or at least as the first practising worshipper of the one true God. I will also present a Jewish text which is in the Christian Bible although not in the Hebrew Bible and presents the same ideas in a more abstract way and without a direct connection with Abraham, although in my opinion it confirms the analysis of the preceding texts. My lecture, then, has three parts: (1) Abraham and the gods in Palestinian Judaism; (2) Abraham and the gods in Hellenistic Judaism; (3) from monolatry to monotheism as the result of Greek influence.

1. Abraham and the Gods in Palestinian Judaism

A book as late as the Book of Judith (which is not in the Hebrew Bible since the Hebrew original has not been preserved) and seems to reflect Pharisaic thought in the period after the Maccabaean revolt (towards the middle of the second century B.C.E.) contains a short phrase that shows us the process of projecting back to the era of the origins beliefs that have evolved over several centuries. The situation, which is fictional of course, is Nebuchadnezzar's invasion, when he sends his general Holophernes to conquer the country. Because of the Jewish resistance, Holophernes assembles the generals of the neighbouring peoples previously subjugated. General Achior, the chief of Moab, sets out before Holophernes a summary of the history of the people of Israel saying that when the people had been faithful to God they were invincible, and when they moved away from God they have been the easy prey of its enemies. At the beginning of his speech, Achior says:

> This people descended from the Chaldeans; first they settled in Mesopotamia because they did not wish to worship the gods of their fathers who were in the land of the Chaldeans. They deviated from the path of their ancestors, worshipping the God of heaven, the god whom they had known; then they drove them away from the presence of their gods, they fled to Mesopotamia and settled there for a time. (Jud 5:6–8)

The text does not mention Abraham directly, but for the Jewish public to which it was addressed, this was not necessary. Abraham left Ur of the Chaldees and resided for many years in Haran, in Mesopotamia, before heading for Canaan. What interests us here is the reason given for the patriarch's departure: his refusal to worship the gods of his fathers and his dedication to the God of the heaven. All later history of the people of Israel is thus presented as a path towards monotheism. However, in my opinion, the text still remains at the level of what we call "monolatry." The God of heaven is the God the people have known, a much more powerful God than the other gods, since when the people remain faithful, he guarantees them victory against other peoples and their less powerful gods. The fact that it is not a Jew who proposes these ideas does not seem to be a problem, since the plot of the Book of Judith as a whole confirms it. When the heroine cut off the head of Holophernes, she provides irrefutable proof of the truth of Achior's thesis.

The explicit attribution to Abraham of the "invention" of monotheism is found for the first time in the *Book of Jubilees*. This is also a work composed in Israel, originally written in Hebrew towards the middle of the second century B.C.E. *Jubilees* has only been preserved completely in Ethiopic (the language into which it was translated from a lost Greek translation; it was also translated into Latin). However, we now have about ten fragmentary copies of the original Hebrew found among the Dead Sea Scrolls. These copies guarantee us the reliability of the Ethiopic translation, which allows us to use it with confidence, even though it was made at a later period than the one we are discussing. *Jubilees* is a good example of the mechanisms that led to the transformation of the image of Abraham into a paradigm of a fervent combatant against idolatry, although here too I think that we must speak of "monolatry" rather than of "monotheism" in the strict sense.

In chapter 11 of the work, the author begins by describing the new corruption invading the whole earth after the flood and the dispersion of the sons of Noah. He presents the family of Abraham to us, installed in the city of Ur and rooted in the idolatrous practices of his city. However he takes good care to stress that this aberration, which for its author is polytheism and idolatry, is due to the influence of Mastema, the chief of the angels who pervert mankind. In *Jubilees* we read:

> Ur, son of Kesed, built Ur of the Chaldees to which he gave his name and the name of his father (formation from eponyms from the two components of Ur-Kasdim, Ur of the Chaldees in Gen 11:28). Foundation statues were made and they worshipped each of their metal idols. They began to make unclean

> sculptures and images and the evil spirits assisted them encouraging them to commit sin and iniquity: to destroy, ruin and spill blood on the earth. This is why Sarug was given that name (in Aramaic *sargeg*, "to lead astray"), as they were all set on committing all kinds of sin. He grew and stayed in Ur of the Chaldees, close to the father of his wife's mother, and worshipped idols. (*Jub.* 11:3–7)

The author continues with a lovely story about the crows that Mastema sends to eat the seeds that had been sown (which he uses to explain the name of Terah, Abraham's father) and that Abraham (at the age of 14) succeeds in throwing them out, thus acquiring great renown in the whole of Chaldea. Here we cannot spend any time on this anecdote about Abraham and the crows, although it is interesting to note that the author, in an aside, already points to what would be his main topic in presenting the patriarch. "The boy (Abraham) began to know the error of the earth, how they all went astray after statues and abomination. His father taught him scripture when he was two septenaries old, and he left his father so as not to worship idols like him" (*Jub.* 11:16). For the author of *Jubilees*, both the miracle of the expulsion of the crows and the invention of the plough, an invention it ascribed to Abraham to save him from having to return each year to the field to protect the harvests, serve to establish Abraham's authority within his own family and in front of his co-citizens, and form the basis of the central proclamation: the God of the heaven is much more powerful than Mastema who is the one who sends the crows; since Abraham does not worship idols, he throws them out. Only the God of heaven is worthy of adoration; all other gods mean nothing. The author sets out these ideas in the form of a dialogue between Abraham and his father which expands halfway (shifting from the singular to the plural) to address all men.

> In the sixth septenary, in his seventh year, said Abraham to Terah: "Father." He replied: "Here I am, my son." Abraham continued: "What assistance and use do these idols bring us whom you worship and before whom you prostrate yourself? They have no spirit, as they are silent and leading the mind astray. Do not worship them. Worship the God of the heaven, who makes dew and rain come down on the earth. He makes everything in it, has created everything with his voice, and all life comes from him. Why do you worship what lack spirit and are made by hand? You carry them on your shoulders, and they provide you with no more help than the great of those who make them and the leading astray of the minds of those who worship them! Do not worship them." (*Jub.* 12:1–5)

The most interesting aspect of this passage is that the author reuses and quotes classical expressions from the Hebrew Bible in his struggle

against the people straying, and its condemnation of false gods, like Ps 135, Jer 10, or Isa 46, attributing those to Abraham. Terah, of course, acknowledges the truth of what Abraham tells him. Yet he does not decide to abandon idolatry for fear of the consequences: "If I tell them the truth, they will kill me, for their spirits adhere to their adoration and praise. Keep quiet, my son, lest they kill you." Evidently, Abraham not only fails to keep quiet, but he actually does something and at thirty-two years of age (or at sixty, the text is slightly confused) he burns down the temple of Ur with all its gods:

> In the thirty-second year of Abraham's life, that is, at four septenaries and four years, he went by night and burned the temple of the idols with everything in it, without anybody knowing. They came by night and tried to save their gods from the fire. Haran rushed to save them: he was set on fire and burned in the blaze, dying in Ur of the Chaldees in front of his father, Terah, and there they buried him. (*Jub.* 12:12–14)

The other gods are unable to save themselves from the fire, and neither the efforts of their followers nor of Abraham's brother succeeded. *Jubilees* certainly supposes progress in reflection about the one God as shown by the motivation the author gives to Abraham for abandoning the science of astronomy. Other Jewish texts, developing other elements from the Genesis stories about Abraham ("count the stars, since your descendants will be even more numerous"; Gen 15:5), make him not only the greatest astronomer, but the founder of astronomy and the instructor of the Egyptian astronomers. But for the author of *Jubilees*, the heavenly bodies have lost all their divine qualities and are completely in God's hands.

> In the sixth septenary, in his fifth year, Abraham remained at night at the beginning of the seventh month to observe the stars from the evening to the morning and to see what would be the course of the year in respect of rain. He was alone, seated, observing, when he felt in his heart a voice that said to him: "All the constellations of the stars, of the sun and the moon are in the hands of the Lord, why do you have to study them? If he wishes, he will make it rain morning and night, and if he wishes, he will not let anything fall: everything is in his hands." (*Jub.* 12:16–18)

The God of Abraham in *Jubilees* is the creator God and all-powerful. However, I do not think that the *Book of Jubilees* makes the definitive move from monolatry to monotheism. Abraham's fight against false gods, although it supposes an advance with respect to the texts of the Hebrew Bible, remains within the same perspective: the God of the elect, the exclusive God of the covenant with his people, the creator God, all-powerful, is the only God of the people of Israel. The best proof of this is to be found in

the prayer that precedes the divine command to leave the country that in *Jubilees* already includes the promise of descendants and possession of the land of Canaan.

> My God, God Most High, only you are God for me. You have created everything and all that exists is the work of your hands. I have chosen you as my deity. Save me from the evil spirits who rule the thoughts of the men; may they not lead me astray from you, my God, and never allow my descendants and me to err from now and forever. (*Jub.* 12:19)

My interpretation of these quotations from *Jubilees* is correct, as is shown when *Jubilees* is compared with another, later text, that uses the same motifs as *Jubilees*, although there Abraham clearly appears as the inventor of Jewish monotheism. This work is the *Apocalypse of Abraham*. It is a midrashic composition of uncertain origin and date, probably written in Hebrew in the second century C.E., but only preserved in Old Slavonic. The whole of the first part recounts Abraham's fight with false gods. The narrative context is the same as in *Jubilees*, with Abraham growing up from childhood in the house of his father Terah, who as in *Jubilees* is portrayed as an idol-worshipper, specifically of the god Marumath. In the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, the father of Abraham does not only worship idols but actually makes them and also functions as their priest, involving Abraham in this "business." You can read a couple of the anecdotes that the author relates to prepare the reader for Abraham's profession of monotheistic faith. These anecdotes have all the flavour of popular stories, spiced with a healthy dose of humour and irony:

> 1. On the day that I (Abraham) was guarding the gods of my father Terah and my brother Nahor, he was testing which god was the strongest. When it came to my turn, as I was completing the service of my father Terah's sacrifices to his gods of wood, stone, gold, silver, copper and iron, and having entered the temple for service, I came across a god made of stone called Marumath, fallen at the feet of Nakhin, a god made of iron. On seeing it I was puzzled, thinking that, as it was very heavy and was made of a large stone, I, Abraham, could not put it back in its place. I went and told my father who returned with me. And when both of us lifted it up to put it in its place, its head, which I was holding in my hands, broke off. When my father saw that Marumath's head had fallen, he said to me: "Bring me the hammer and chisel from home." When I had brought them, he carved another Marumath in stone, without a head, and destroyed Marumath's fallen head and the rest of Marumath.
>
> 2. Then he made another five gods and ordered me to sell them outside, on the road to the city. I saddled up my father's donkey, loaded them on it and set out on the road to sell them. And I met a caravan of merchants from Padan-Aram in Syria, who were travelling with camels to buy purple from

> the Nile. While I was talking to them, one of the camels grunted and the donkey was startled, starting to run and throwing off his load of gods. Three were destroyed but two remained intact. On seeing what happened, the Syrians said to me: "Why didn't you tell us that you had gods? We would have bought them from you before the donkey was startled and so you would not have suffered a loss. In any case, give us the gods that are left and we will pay you a suitable price." And they paid me for the broken gods and for the ones that were left. And I threw the three broken ones into river Gur, and they sank into the depths of the river Gur and ceased to exist.

These facts cause Abraham to reflect, and in chapters 3 and 4 he begins to draw the inevitable conclusions and finishes by telling Terah everything that happened, only succeeding in making his father angry with him for speaking badly of the gods. Chapter 5 contains another equally colourful anecdote about the god Barisat.

> 5. My father called me and said: "Collect the wood-shavings that I have used to carve the gods, and use them to prepare my meal." When I was collecting the shavings, among them I found a small god that fitted my left hand. On its forehead I read: "The god Barisat." And when I put the shavings in the fire to prepare the meal, I had to go out to find the food, but beforehand I sat the god in front of the fire and said to him: "Barisat, take care that the fire does not go out before I return. If it is about to go out, blow on it to revive it." When I returned, I found Barisat fallen on the ground with his feet burning. When I saw him I laughed and said to myself: "Truly, Barisat, you know how to cook and to light the fire." And I saw the fire consume him completely and turn him into ashes. I brought the food to my father and offered him milk and wine. He drank and was happy and blessed his god Maruma(th). However I told him: "Father Terah, do not bless your god Marumath or praise him. Rather, praise Barisat your god, because he rolled into the fire to prepare your meal." And he said to me: "Where is he now?" I answered him: "He has been completely consumed by the fire and has become ash." And he said: "Great is the power of Barisat! I will make another one right now and tomorrow he will prepare my meal."

This anecdote, too, is followed by Abraham's due reflections, of his doubts about the meaning of gods made by the hand of man and of Abraham's purpose in communicating these reflections to his father in order to convince him, even though without success. One of the arguments Abraham uses is that his brother's god, Zuchaios, is made of gold, which is more valuable than stone. If it grows old and breaks, as happened to Marumath, it can be moulded again and continue to function as if nothing had happened. After these reflections comes chapter 7, which culminates in the presentation of Abraham's thought in a didactic poem, in which the various elements considered as gods are systematically eliminated:

> 7. Having thought this, Abraham came to his father and said to him: "Father Terah, fire is more venerable than your gods, gods of gold and silver, and of stone and wood, since fire burns them. And when your gods are burned, they obey the fire, and the fire mocks them when it consumes them. However, it is not possible to call a fire god because it is subjugated by water. Water is more worthy of adoration than it because it overcomes fire and adorns the earth with fruit. Nor can water be considered a god because it disappears into the earth and is subject to it. Nor the earth, which is subject to man who tills it and to the sun which dries it. The sun is more adorable because its rays illuminate the whole universe. However, not even it can be considered a god, because when night comes it is hidden in darkness. However, listen, my father Terah; I shall go to seek who is the God who created all the gods that we imagine. Who is he? Or who is he who has made the heavens and the sun that has given light to the moon and the stars, who has dried the earth in the midst of the waters, who has placed us in the middle of these things, and who has sought me in the perplexity of my thoughts?

The reply to this question is not formulated in the abstract language of philosophy, but in the language of revelation and of the profession of faith. However this does not mean it is not equally clear. The answer is given by the very voice of God, who acknowledges Abraham's questions as perfectly valid and presents himself as the only answer to his questions.

> 8. When I saw these and those things in relation to my father Terah in the courtyard of my home, the voice of the Almighty came down from the heavens in a current of fire, calling and saying: "Abraham, Abraham." And I said: "Here I am." And he said: "You seek the God of gods, the creator, in the knowledge of your heart. I am he. Go away from Terah, your father, and leave home, so that you will not be destroyed by the sins of the house of your father." And I left. And it happened that when I left—I had not yet passed the entrance of the courtyard—the sound of a great thunderbolt came and burned to the ground him and his house and everything that was in it.

The large gap between this presentation of Abraham, as the inventor of monotheism, and the account we read in *Jubilees* is quite obvious. In the *Apocalypse of Abraham* we find the traditional position within Judaism. And in fact, in many works of rabbinic literature, such as *Genesis Rabbah* or the Talmud, there are different versions of the same stories and of the didactic poem that precedes Abraham's confession of faith in a single God, creator of all and almighty, and not only in the God of his people and of his chosen ones. What happened in the two or three centuries separating these two texts which project their conception of divinity onto Abraham? A couple of Jewish texts, chronologically dated between *Jubilees* and

the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, can supply the answer to this question, even though written in a different cultural milieu, i.e., the diaspora in a world imbued with Greek ideas.

2. Abraham and the Gods in Hellenistic Judaism

The first of the two texts in this second part is a short extract from one of the works by Philo of Alexandria, who lived in the first half of the first century C.E. Philo writes like a Jewish exegete, addressing his fellow believers, who like him have been imbued with Greek ideas, trying to explain to them the true meaning of the sacred text through an allegorical interpretation. Philo writes in Greek and has a perfect knowledge of the popular philosophy of his time. One of his main aims is to show specifically that the best ideas of Greek wisdom have not only been expressed already in the Bible but that the Greek philosophers have taken them from there. In *De Abrahamo*, he devotes a short passage to the problem that concerns us here. Speaking of the patriarch he states:

> The Chaldeans are particularly experts in astronomy and ascribe everything to the movements of the stars, believing that everything in the world is governed by understood forces and numerical ratios. They praise the existence of what is visible and pay no attention to what is (only) perceived by the mind and is invisible. However, seeking numerical arrangement according to the cycles of the sun, the moon, the planets and the fixed stars, together with the changes of the seasons of the year and the relationship between what happens in heaven and what takes place on earth, they supposed that the world itself was god, sacrilegiously making equal what was created by the Creator and what he created. He (Abraham) grew up with this idea and for some time was a true Chaldean, until, opening the eyes of his soul in the depths of sleep, he saw the pure ray in the place of the deep darkness, and followed this light, and saw what he had not seen before, One who guides and governs the world, presiding over it and guiding its affairs. (*Abr.* 69–71)

Here Abraham is portrayed as a true Chaldean, an astronomer, until he invents monotheism on discovering the profound meaning of reality. Philo, who in another of his essays, *De Creatione*, went on at great length about the philosophical disputes on the origins, is very concise here: against a world full of gods, what Abraham discovers is "the one," who presides over and governs everything. His language is the language of philosophers, but its content is exactly the same as in the accounts of the *Apocalypse of Abraham*.

The second extract comes from the *Biblical Antiquities* by Flavius Josephus. This Jewish historian, who lived in the second half of the first century

C.E., wrote this great work between 93 and 94. If in his *War* (his other great historical work) Josephus restricts himself to the revolt against Rome and the immediately preceding history, in the twenty books of *Antiquities* he wishes to cover the history of the Jewish people from the creation to the start of the revolt against Rome. Whereas in his *War* Josephus draws on his own experience, in his *Antiquities* he sets out the history of the people by paraphrasing the biblical text, supplementing it with information that he derives from other Greek and Jewish writings. His account of the history of Abraham is in the first book of the *Antiquities*, corresponding to numbers 148–265 in the Loeb edition. Among the elements of his paraphrase that have no equivalent in the biblical text is his description of Abraham as the inventor of monotheism.

> For this reason, his conception of (Abraham's) virtue surpassed that of all other people and he came to hold a new understanding and to modify the idea of God held by the others. Thus he became the first person to argue that there is only one God who is the creator of all things, and that if any of these things contributes to the well-being of the world, it can only do so under his orders and not by its own powers. He was able to deduce this from the changes that happen on land and in the sea, from those that happen in the sun and moon and from all those that happen in the firmament. Given that if these heavenly bodies had any power over themselves, they would have arranged things to have a correct order; however, as it is not like that, it is clear that they have been arranged for our service not by their own authority but by the power of the Only One who commands, to whom alone honour should be paid and thanks given. For these ideas, the Chaldeans and the other peoples of Mesopotamia rose up against him, and having decided in agreement with the will of God and with his help, to leave his home, he settled in the land of Canaan. (*Ant.* 1.154–157)

Abraham is not only the first "monotheist" in the strict sense (the first person who *argues* there is a single God who is the creator of all things), but the one who presents this conclusion as a purely logical deduction, like that of the unique God of the philosophers, without any kind of intervention either of the divine voice that Abraham hears according to the *Apocalypse of Abraham* or of the perception during sleep of this illuminating ray of divine light that Philo mentions to explain Abraham's monotheism. As in the Palestinian texts in the first part of this paper, Abraham's departure from Ur and his installation in the land of Canaan are related directly to this fundamental element in religious history, which is projected into the remotest past, not in Mosaic revelation, but in the very origins of the people of Israel. However, in this reverse journey, the influence of Greek thought is transparent.

These two texts of two Jewish writers imbued with the Greek culture of the first century C.E. enable us to understand the difference between the *Book of Jubilees* of the second century B.C.E. (which ascribes to Abraham a monolatry very close to the one in the oracles of Second Isaiah) and the stories inspired by it and repeated in rabbinic tradition that we have read in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* of the second century C.E.

3. From Monolatry to Monotheism as a Result of Greek Influence

I think that the differences between the two types of text cited are clear enough to be able to conclude that monotheism (in the sense that we use this word today, as the philosophical principle that there can be only one deity or absolute divine principle, called Yahweh, Allah, or the unique and Trinitarian God of Christianity) is not an internal development of biblical thought. More probably it was reached due to the need to adapt the biblical conception of God to the philosophical categories circulated by Hellenism.

The proof (or confirmation) that this conclusion is correct is provided by two texts from Hellenistic Judaism, written in Greek and in Alexandria, in a period before Philo and Josephus, which have the same ideological development, but without any reference to Abraham. The first text, relates this evolution to Moses (the first monotheist according to other Jewish texts), and criticises both Greek and Egyptian polytheism and at the same time is reminiscent of the polemics against the idols that are common currency in the biblical text. It is a fragment of the *Letter of Aristeas*, a text about the translation of the Hebrew Bible into Greek, fictitiously set in the court of Ptolemy II Philadelphus (from the first half of the third century B.C.E.) but in fact written in the second century B.C.E. In the speech in which Eleazar gives a defence of the law and of Moses the lawgiver, we find a diatribe against polytheism and idolatry. It is an attack on both Greek and Egyptian religion and rejects the principles of the divine cult of the emperor and the Euhemeristic principles about the origins of the Gods, using the Neo-Platonic concept of philosophical monotheism, presented as exclusive to Jewish thought.

> In absolute first place (Moses, the legislator and author of the Jewish Law) taught that God is one and that his power appears through all things, since every place is full of his power and nothing that men do secretly on earth is hidden from him. Rather, everything that we do is evident to him and

> what is going to happen. Once this premise is established with accuracy and made clear, he showed that even if we should think of doing something bad, it would not be hidden from him, and even less if we come to commit it, putting the emphasis on God's power through all the law. After anticipating these principles he showed that all other men, apart from us, think there are many gods, although they are much more powerful than those whom they vainly worship, since they fashion them in wood and stone and state that they are images of the one who has invented something useful for life, whom they worship, although their lack of senses is obvious. So it is completely absurd that one has to be god by virtue of his inventions. For they took some of the created things, assembled them and realised that they seemed useful. However, they did not produce them themselves, so it is vain and useless to deify such men. In fact, even now there are many who have invented more and are much better educated than those of former days and nobody thought of worshipping them. They also think that those who shaped and invented these myths are the wisest of the Greeks. And what will we say about the other senseless people, the Egyptians and the like, who have placed their trust in creepy-crawlies—chiefly reptiles and little animals—and worship them and sacrifice to them alive and dead? (*Let. Aris.* 132–138)

The second of the texts (my final text) comes from the Christian Bible, not the Jewish Bible, although undoubtedly its author was an orthodox Jew from Alexandria with an education in philosophy, who wrote this work in Greek in the first century B.C.E. Of course, I am referring to the Book of Wisdom. In chapters 13–15 of this book, we find the only systematic treatise in all the Old Testament on the problem of idolatry. It is a treatise without exact parallels in the Greek world, which develops the ideas of Second Isaiah in the light of the philosophical principles that inspire the whole work. These three chapters (which you can read calmly at home, since unlike the preceding texts they are included in Christian bibles) are too long to be read here; however, I cannot resist the temptation to quote the first verses of this long sapiential poem which compares the experience of Israel with the idea of the unique God of Greek philosophy:

> Thus, what fools by nature are all men who were unaware of God and were unable to know that he exists, from visible things, nor did they recognise the artificer by paying attention to his works. Instead they took as gods ruling the world, fire, wind, breezes, constellations, rushing water or the luminaries of the heavens. If, bewitched by their beauty, they took them for gods, they should know how much better than these is their master; for the progenitor of their beauty created them. And if they were amazed by their power and energy, they should think how much more powerful than them is he who shaped them. Because the greatness and beauty of the creatures allow their creator to be seen in a similar way. (Wis 13:1–5)

Whereas these verses have a strong Greek tone, the beginning of chapter 15 is purely Jewish, and the God present there is the God who acts in the history of his people and in that of every man:

> However, you, our God, are kind and sincere, patient and a benevolent ruler of all; since even when we sin, we are yours, knowing your power; however, we shall not sin, knowing that we are considered yours. For to know you is perfect justice, and to know your power is the root of immortality. (Wis 15:1–3)

It is time to finish. Neither of the two texts of this third section mentions Abraham. However I think that they can provide us with the proof that Greek philosophical thought has been an important factor in the development of formulating monotheism, exactly as we understand it. Not at the level of experience, but at the level of formulation. Thanks to its influence, the anecdotes about Abraham and the gods with which we began, that set the discovery of monotheism back in the period of the origins of the Jewish people, are like milestones along the long path we have travelled.

Fundamentally, the conclusion of this lecture simply confirms something that we could have supposed from the beginning. In the Hebrew Bible, knowledge of the deity is not the result of reasoning. Knowledge of God is the result of the experience of him acting in favour of his people, of the awareness of divine election, of the certitude of the divine fidelity to his promises, of knowing oneself "supported by God's hands at the moment of danger," of being saved from the abyss, and so many other expressions of the experience of divine love which underlies the belief of the people. Ultimately, the "monolatry" of Second Isaiah is the best expression of what we could call "biblical monotheism."

Instead, in the Greek world, knowledge of God is the result of reasoning, of logic. The text of the Book of Wisdom assures us not only that this reasoning is perfectly legitimate for a Jew (whether or not he speaks Greek) but that its result, the only principle to which reasoning leads, is none other than the God whom Israel has known and accepted through his intervention in the history of the people.

This fusion of the saving experience of God in the history of the Jewish people (whether or not attributed to Abraham) with Greek logic, which demands the existence of a single principle, is what opens the path to the monotheism that we know and has permeated the history of the West for two thousand years.

CHAPTER TWO

THE FORESKINS OF ANGELS[1]

Arguments about the sex of angels have always been considered to be one of the clearest examples of the futility of scholastic discussion as being completely out of touch with reality. In a patriarchal society, such as the one in which the biblical accounts were produced, angels (like God) were evidently and obviously considered to be masculine. As far as I know, in rabbinic literature, only in *Lev. Rab.* 31:5 does it specify that all angels are males and there are no females among them. In a text in which "the city" of Prov 21:22 is seen as a symbol of heaven, and the "powerful ones" of this text denote angels, it specifies:

> R. Joshua of Siknin said in the name of R. Aja: One wise man scales the city of the powerful (Prov 21:22) (גִּבֹּרִים). The text has men (גְּבָרִים) because they are all males; there are no females among them.[2]

There is absolutely no need to insist on angels being masculine in the Old Testament and any discussion about it would be useless. In fact, the few indications available concerning the sex of angels that we find in the Hebrew Bible stress this masculinity. In Genesis, for example, the angels that come down to unite with women are clearly considered to be male. The biblical text not only states that "the sons of God (בני האלהים is the term used here by the biblical text to denote angelic beings), seeing that the daughters of men were beautiful, took wives from among all those that pleased them most" (Gen 6:2); it also adds "when the sons of God united with the daughters of man and they bore them sons" (Gen 6:4), so stressing that the sex of some of the angels (and not only the grammatical gender of the Hebrew words used to denote them) is considered to be masculine without any doubt.

This myth, of which no other traces remain in the Old Testament, was to be considerably developed in the *Books of Enoch*, especially in the first

---

[1] It is a pleasure to dedicate this short note to Domingo Muñoz León as a token of friendship and appreciation for always keeping the pages of *Estudios Bíblicos* as well as the doors of his office in the C.S.I.C. in Madrid open for me.

[2] See the commentary by M. Kadushin, *A Conceptual Commentary on Midrash Leviticus Rabbah: Value Concepts in Jewish Thought* (BJS 126; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 212.

of the compositions forming the Ethiopic and Greek collection known as *1 Enoch* and has the title *The Book of the Watchers* (*1 En.* 1–36), of which various copies of the Aramaic original have been found at Qumran.[3] In *1 En.* 15:3–7, for example, the patriarch is lifted up into heaven in a vision, and when he tries to intercede for the fallen angels he is entrusted with transmitting the following message to the Watchers from the Most High:

> Why have you forsaken the high heaven, the eternal sanctuary;
> and lain with women, and defiled yourselves with the daughters of men;
> and taken for yourselves wives, and sons as the sons of the earth;
> and begotten for yourselves sons, giants?
> You were holy ones and spirits, living forever.
> With the blood of women you have defiled yourselves,
> and with the blood of flesh you have begotten;
> And with the the blood of men you have lusted,
> and you have done as they do—
> flesh and blood, who die and perish.
> Therefore I gave them women,
> that they might cast seed into them,
> and thus beget children by them,
> that nothing fail them on the earth.
> But you originally existed as spirits, living forever,
> and not dying for all the generations of eternity.
> Therefore I did not make women among you.
> The spirits of heaven, in heaven is their dwelling. (*1 En.* 15:3–7)[4]

The second of the compositions in the collection under the name of the patriarch, the *Book of Parables* (*1 En.* 37–71), is a slightly later composition of which nothing was found in Qumran. In ch. 69 there is a long description of the names and functions of each of the fallen angels.[5]

And in the fourth composition, in the collection under the name of the patriarch, in the *Book of Dreams* (*1 En.* 83–90), in the section called

---

[3] For a short description of this material and its editions see the corresponding sections in G. Aranda Pérez, F. García Martínez, and M. Pérez Fernández, *Literatura judía intertestamentaria* (IEB 9; Estella: Verbo Divino, 1996), 138–47 and 272–92. For a recent study that includes much of the earlier bibliography, see L. T. Stuckenbruck, "The Origins of Evil in Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition: The Interpretation of Genesis 6:1–4 in the Second and Third Centuries B.C.E.," in *The Fall of the Angels* (ed. C. Auffahrt and L. T. Stuckenbruck; TBN 6; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 87–118.

[4] All translations from *1 Enoch* are from G. W. E. Nickelsburg and J. C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch: A New Translation* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004).

[5] See the commentary by S. Chialà, *Libro delle parabole di Enoc* (Studi Biblici 117; Brescia: Paideia, 1997), 130–34. For recent discussion on the *Book of Parables* see the collection of articles in G. Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2007).

the *Animal Apocalypse* (*1 En.* 85–90) in which the various protagonists are symbolised by different animals, there is a more graphic allusion to the same myth. Here, the emphasis is on the masculinity of the fallen angels, symbolised as "stars":

> And again I saw in the vision, and I looked to heaven, and look, I saw many stars descend and cast themselves down from heaven to that first star. And in the midst of those calves they became bulls, and they were pasturing with them in their midst. I looked at them and I saw and look, all of them let out their organs like horses, and they began to mount the cows of the bulls, and they all conceived and bore elephants and camels and asses. And all the bulls feared them and were terrified before them, and they began to bite with their teeth and devour and gore with their horns. (*1 En.* 86:3–5)

Also, in *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* on Gen 4:1, we find a similar indication that at least one of the angels is imagined as being clearly of the male sex, since in this Targum, Eve begets Cain with Samael and not with Adam:[6]

> And Adam knew Eve, his wife, who had desired the angel, and she conceived from Samael, the angel of the Lord, and gave birth to Cain; and she said: "I have obtained through man the angel of the Lord."[7]

An echo of this tradition is to be found in the New Testament, in John 8:44 and especially in the expression "sons of the devil" of 1 John 3:10. It is also found in the words "Cain: he came from Evil" of 1 John 3:12, at least according to some commentators[8] and some specialists in Targumic literature.[9] Domingo Muñoz León translates the text of 1 John 3:12a: "Cain, being from the Wicked One, killed his brother" and carefully notes that "the midrash on Cain and Abel, which in our view begins at 2:28, has a series of details

---

[6] See also below, ch. 7, "Eve's Children in the Targumim," where I cite and comment on other rabbinic texts in which this tradition is to be found, and my "Caín, su padre, y el origen del Mal," in *Palabra, prodigio, poesía: In memoriam P. Luis Alonso Schökel, S.J.* (ed. V. Collado Bertomeu; AnBib 151; Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2003), 17–35.

[7] Translation of the *editio princeps* of the 1591 Targum. The edition of the Targum in the *Polyglotta Matritensia* gives the text of the manuscript of British Library Aramaic Additional MS 27031, which has a shorter text, without Eve's exclamation and which T. Martínez in *Biblia polyglotta Matritensia: 4: Targum Palaestinense in Pentateuchum. 1 Genesis* (Madrid: CSIC, 1998), 29, translates: "And Adam knew Eve, his wife, who had conceived from Samael, angel of Yahweh."

[8] For example, R. E. Brown, *The Epistles of John* (AB; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1982), 442–43.

[9] For instance, M. Pérez Fernández, *Tradiciones mesiánicas en el Targum Palestinense* (Valencia: Soler, 1981), 50–52 and R. Le Déaut, *The Message of the New Testament and the Aramaic Bible* (Rome: Biblical Institute, 1982), 40–42.

that seem to be inspired by a tradition similar to the Palestinian Targum for Gen 4:8ff."[10]

In fact, these supplementary indications can easily be disregarded, since the fallen angels, as well as Samael, would very soon be considered as "demons."[11] And within Jewish tradition we find demons of the male sex as well as demons of the female sex. Among these, the most notorious (and the most common in cabbalistic writings) is Lilith.[12] She begins by being the primordial Eve and rapidly turns into a female demon who destroys her own sons, attacks women who are giving birth and very soon (already in one of the texts from Qumran)[13] ends up becoming a generic name for female demons.

Perhaps this is why the New Testament, unlike the Old Testament, insists on the spiritual nature of angelic beings, who are portrayed as asexual. Thus, in the three Synoptic Gospels, as part of a dispute with the Sadducees about the resurrection, it is assumed that angels are asexual since, like them, resurrected men and women will have no sexual activity. This asexual nature is placed in the foreground in the Gospels of Matthew and Mark. In Matt 22:30 it says: "For in the resurrection, they take neither wife nor husband but are like the angels in heaven," and in Mark 12:25: "For when they arise from among the dead, they will take neither wife nor husband but will be like the angels in heaven." In the Gospel of Luke, the emphasis is on the immortality of the resurrected ones, an element of angelic nature already stressed in the text from *1 Enoch* cited above:

> Those who belong to this age marry and are given in marriage; but those who are considered worthy of a place in that age and in the resurrection from the dead neither marry nor are given in marriage. Indeed they cannot die anymore, because they are like angels and are children of God, being children of the resurrection. (Luke 20:34–36; NRSV)

However, the asexual nature of angels is clear in Luke as well, not only from the inclusion of "neither marry nor are given in marriage," common

---

[10] D. Muñoz León, *Palabra y Gloria: Excursus en la Biblia y en la literatura intertestamentaria* (Verbum Gloriae 4; Madrid: CSIC, 1983), 317.

[11] See, for example, *Pirqe R. El.* 13:2, 14:3 and especially 22:2–3 as well as the commentary by Pérez Fernández, *Tradiciones mesiánicas*, 87 on the influence of Shamael's fall on the New Testament.

[12] Lilith has attracted the attention of scholars (and not only of feminists who have reclaimed her image) and there are very many works about her. See the bibliography based on the work of T. R. W. Longstaff, which is presently accessible on http://jewishchristianlit.com/Topics/Lilith/.

[13] 4Q510 and 4Q511, edited by M. Baillet in DJD 7:215–62; translated in *DSST*, 371–76.

to all the Synoptic Gospels, but also because Luke transmits the dispute with the Sadducees that provoked this reply. Therefore, the New Testament continues a development of the spiritualisation of angelic beings that was already clearly indicated in *1 Enoch*, where the "messengers" are also portrayed as "spirits." However, this "spiritualisation" is not found in all the writings that develop the image of angels and, as we will see below, the *Book of Jubilees* provides us with one of the crudest and most surprising statements of the masculinity of a certain kind of angel, those who have been circumcised.

The Old Testament says nothing about the creation of angels, or about when or how, and their specific nature and the actual functions have to be deduced from the names it gives them, from the actions it ascribes to them and the way they are portrayed. This biblical silence would allow considerable freedom in the development of angelology in later Jewish literature.[14] Therefore in this literature we find wide-ranging opinions about when the angels were created: on the first day, on the second, on the fifth and even before the beginning of creation.[15]

The *Book of Jubilees* specifies very clearly the creation of numerous angelic beings on the first day of creation as well as a multitude of different types of angels who govern all natural phenomena:

> For on the first day he created the heavens that are above, the earth, the waters, and all the spirits who serve before him, namely: the angels of the presence; the angels of holiness; the angels of the spirits of fire; the angels of the spirits of the winds; the angels of the spirits of the clouds, of darkness, snow, hail, and frost; the angels of the sounds, the thunders, and the lightnings; and the angels of the spirits of cold and heat, of winter, spring, autumn, and summer, and of all the spirits of his creatures which are in the heavens, on earth, and in every (place). [There were also] the depths, darkness and light, dawn and evening which he prepared through the knowledge of his mind. Then we saw his works and blessed him. We offered praise before him regarding all his works because he had made seven great works on the first day. (*Jub.* 2:2–3)[16]

---

[14] For a good summary, see M. Mach, *Entwicklungsstadien des jüdischen Engelglaubens in vorrabbinischer Zeit* (TSAJ 34; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992).

[15] For examples see J. L. Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible As It Was at the Start of the Common Era* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998), 74–77.

[16] For a study of this text see J. T. A. G. M. van Ruiten, *Primeval History Interpreted: The Rewriting of Genesis 1–11 in the Book of Jubilees* (JSJSup 66; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 20–27. Translations of *Jubilees* are from J. C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees: Translation* (CSCO 511; Scriptores Aethiopici 88; Leuven: Peeters, 1989).

In *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan*,[17] as in the *Pirqe Rabbi Eliezer*,[18] the angels were not created on the first day but on the second. Instead, *Genesis Rabbah* prefers to set the creation of angels on the fifth day, although it does not exclude the second day as possible, and argues against *Jubilees* and against those who claim that they were created on the first day:

> The angels were created on the second day, as proved by *You build your lodgings in the waters* (Ps 104:3) *and make the winds your messengers* (Ps 104:4). R. Janina said: The angels were created on the fifth day, for it is written: *And the birds fly above the earth* (Gen 1:20), and also: *And with two* [*wings*] *they flew* (Isa 6:2). R. Luliani bar Tabari said, in the name of R. Yishaq: Whether one accepts the opinion of R. Janina or whether one accepts the opinion of R. Yohanan, everyone accepts that none were created on the first day. (*Gen. Rab.* 3:8)[19]

In Jewish literature we also find the same variety of opinions concerning the material from which they were made. Angels were created from fire (like Michael) or snow (like Gabriel), as shown several times in rabbinic literature[20] although in other texts, angels seem to have a changeable nature which is transformed depending on the missions on which they are sent. As *Pirqe Rabbi Eliezer* notes:

> The angels created on the second day, when they are sent by His word, turn into winds, and when they serve before Him, they turn into fire, as it says: "He makes his messengers the winds, his ministers flaming fire" (Ps 104:4). (*Pirqe R. El.* 4:1)[21]

In other texts it is not the nature of the angels that changes in connection with their mission but the human perception of angels, which is confused by the angel's appearance. In Tob 12:19, in the Greek version of the Codex

---

[17] *Tg. Ps.-J. Gen.* 1:26: "And God said to the angels who serve before Him, who were created on the second day of the creation of the world."

[18] *Pirqe R. El.* 4:1: "On the second day, the Holy One, blessed be he, created the firmament and the angels, the fire of flesh and the fire of gehenna." M. Pérez Fernández, *Los Capítulos de Rabbi Eliezer* (Valencia: S. Jerónimo, 1984), 71.

[19] See the translation of L. Vegas Montaner, *Génesis Rabbah I* (*Génesis 1–11*) (BMidr 15; Estella: Verbo Divino, 1994), 77.

[20] Although in other texts, such as *Tg. Job* 25:2, it states that Michael was created from snow and Gabriel from fire. L. Ginzberg, who has collected the relevant quotations, notes in his *Legends of the Jews* V (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1953), 22: "The statement found in many passages of rabbinic literature that Michael was created of fire and Gabriel of snow or water (see Index, *s.v.* 'Michael', 'Gabriel') implies the view that the former belongs to the heaven and the latter to the earth." See also p. 70.

[21] See Pérez Fernández, *Los Capítulos de Rabbi Eliezer*, 72.

Sinaiticus, Raphael explains: "You see that I ate nothing[22] but you had a vision before your eyes." According to Fitzmyer, "Raphael insisted that he belongs to another world, the transcendent world of God, and has no need of human food and drink,"[23] but in my opinion, the text of Tobit suggests something more than the lack of any need for food and drink by the angels. This text teaches us that the form in which the angels are perceived by men does not correspond to angelic nature, but it is merely a vision. This seems confirmed by the statements in other texts that have no problem at all with angels eating, since they identify clearly the daily food of angels with the manna that the Israelites ate during their stay in the desert. The Hebrew text of Ps 78:24–25 says literally that "He made manna rain down on them for food, he gave them grain from heaven; they ate the food of powerful ones (לחם אבירים)." In the Talmud, this is interpreted as the bread of angels: "the bread of powerful ones, who ate the food that angels in service eat, according to R. Akibah" (*b. Yoma* 75b). In this case we can be certain that this rabbinic interpretation has a venerable antiquity since it is reflected in the Greek translation of the Psalms[24] (the LXX translates the beginning of verse 25: ἄρτον ἀγγέλων) and in Wis 16:20: "you fed your people with angels' food."

We find the same range of opinions in the descriptions of the shape of angels. We have already noted the tendency in certain writings to describe them as spiritual beings. However, other texts present them in human form. Thus, in the translation of Gen 18:2 in *Neophyti I*, it says that the three men who approach Abraham, when the Memra of Yahweh appears to him on the plain of the Vision (Gen 18:1), are in fact three "angels in the form of men" (מלאכין בדמות גברין). The use of the word דמות is important since it is one of the terms used in Gen 1:26 to express man's nature, created in the divine image and likeness. It is strange that, even though the book of Genesis specifies without any doubt that man has been created בצלמנו כדמותנו "in our image and likeness" (as usually translated), clearly

[22] The Aramaic original of the passage, preserved in 4Q196 171 1, proves that it is not only food but drink as well: "I did not drink." The Greek version of Codex Vaticanus can be translated: "All these days I simply appeared to you and I did not eat or drink; but you saw a vision."

[23] J. A. Fitzmyer, *Tobit* (CEJL; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003), 298.

[24] This tradition appears in the famous poem by Thomas Aquinas, *Panis Angelicum*; see the study by A. Nye-Knutson, "Hidden Bread and Revealed Word: Manna Traditions in Targums Neophyti 1 and Ps-Jonathan," in *Israel in the Wilderness: Interpretations of the Biblical Narratives in Jewish and Christian Traditions* (ed. K. E. Pomykala; TBN 10; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 201–25.

referring to God, a text from Qumran indicates that man has been created in the image of angels, according to the angelic model. This text, 4Q417 1 i 16–18, is part of the long wisdom composition called *4QInstruction*, of which several exemplars were found in Cave 4. Although not included in the Spanish edition *Textos de Qumrán*, it was included in the English version:[25]

> 16 . . . והואה חזון ההגי וספר זכרון וינחילה לאנוש עם עם רוח כיא 17 כתבנית קדושים יצרו ועיד לוא נתן הגוי לרוח בשר כי לא ידע בין 18 טוב לרע כמשפט רוחו
>
> 16 . . . And this is the vision of meditation and a book of remembrance. And he will give it as an inheritance to Enosh together with /a/ spiritual /people/, for 17 according to the pattern of the holy ones is his fashioning, but he did not give meditation (as) a witness to the spirit of the flesh, for it does not know the difference between 18 good and evil according to the judgment of its spirit.

The text does not use צלם or דמות, but תבנית, the same term used in Exod 25:9, 40 to denote the model of the tabernacle (hence my translation). However, as Collins notes,[26] on the basis of the use of this term in other Qumran texts such as *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*,[27] the most suitable translation would be "image, likeness" as a paraphrase of the expression in Genesis.[28] And since in the Dead Sea Scrolls קדושים generally denotes

---

[25] *DSST*, 387. Here I give the text and translation of *DSSSE*, 857–58, which appeared before the *editio princeps*, and where the fragment was still called 4Q417 2 i. For the *editio princeps*, see J. Strugnell and D. Harrington, *Qumran Cave 4. XXIV: Sapiential Texts, Part 2* (DJD 35; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999), 151–69. The editors provide a slightly different transcription and translation. On the expression כתבנית קדושים they comment: "One should translate תבנית according to biblical Hebrew usage 'according to the image/blue-print/pattern of the Holy Angels'; Enosh and mankind are formed in the image of the angels" (165). For a discussion of the readings in the *editio princeps*, see E. J. C. Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones: Reading and Reconstructing the Fragmentary Early Jewish Sapiential Text 4QInstruction* (STDJ 44; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 52–54. For a study on the content of this passage, see M. J. Goff, *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction* (STDJ 50; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 83–116.

[26] J. J. Collins, "In the Likeness of the Holy Ones: The Creation of Humankind in a Wisdom Text from Qumran," in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (ed. D. W. Parry and E. Ulrich; STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 609–18.

[27] Such as 4Q403 1 ii 3 where תבנית is used to denote the "likeness" of the divine Glory, which Ezek 1:8 calls דמות.

[28] Collins, "In the Likeness," 613: "'Form' would seem to be a possible translation (cf. 1QM 10:14, where תבנית אדם means the forming of humanity at creation) but the parallels we have cited suggest that 'image or likeness' is the more typical usage in the scrolls."

angels,[29] what our text strongly states is that at least part of mankind ("the spiritual people") has been created in the image of angels. In the words of Collins: "The phrase in 4Q417 then can be understood as a paraphrase of Genesis 1:27, taking אלהים in its angelic sense."[30] This explains the reason for this slightly strange statement, since at Qumran, both אלים (frequently) and אלוהים (more rarely) are used to denote angels.[31]

Other texts also suggest that certain particularly important men were created in the image of angels.[32] This idea appears generically in *1 En.* 69:11: "For humans were not created to be different from the angels, so that they should remain pure and righteous," and explicitly in the case of Noah in *1 En.* 106:5:

> And he said to him: A strange child has been born to me. He is not like the human beings, but (like) the sons of the angels of heaven. His form is strange, not like us. His eyes are like the rays of the sun, and glorious is his face.[33]

In these and other comparable texts, human and angelic natures seem to be mixed and blend and the differences between them fade. The point is reached that the *Book of Jubilees* extended to some angels the most typical mark of God's covenant with Abraham and his descendants: circumcision.

Genesis 17:10–11 sets out the covenant that God establishes with Abraham, his descendants and all Israel as follows:

> Behold my covenant, which you must keep between Me and you as well as your offspring after you: all your males shall be circumcised. You shall circumcise yourselves, the flesh of your foreskin, which shall be a sign of the covenant between Me and you.

---

[29] Just like בני שמים, see F. García Martínez, "Marginalia on 4QInstruction," *DSD* 13 (2006): 29–37.

[30] Collins, "In the Likeness," 615.

[31] A simple perusal of concordances proves my point. See M. G. Abegg, J. E. Bowley, and E. M. Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance. Volume One: The Non-Biblical Texts from Qumran* I (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 45–51 and 57–60 respectively. On אלוהים as denoting angels in the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, see C. Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition* (HSS 27; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), 24.

[32] See C. H. T. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 42; Leiden: Brill, 2002).

[33] See the commentary by L. T. Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch 91–108 a Commentary* (CEJL; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007). This account has been partly preserved in 1QGenesis Apocryphon and perhaps comes from the lost *Book of Noah*; see F. García Martínez, "4QMes. Aram, y el Libro de Noé," *Salm* 28 (1981): 195–232.

And Gen 17:23–27 specifies that this covenant must be carried out on that very day:

> Then Abraham took his son Ishmael, all those born in his household and all those acquired by money, all the males from among the peoples of Abraham's household and on that very day circumcised the flesh of their foreskins, as Elohim had told him. Abraham was ninety-nine years old when he circumcised the flesh of his foreskin and Ishmael, his son, was thirteen years of age when he circumcised the flesh of his foreskin. On that same day Abraham and Ishmael, his son, were circumcised. Also all the men of his house, those born in it and those acquired from a foreigner for money, were circumcised with him.

The biblical text is absolutely clear and forms the basis for all theological discussions about circumcision as a mark of divine election. Within the Old Testament, this text would give rise to several stories, which we could label "stories about foreskins." An example is the story of Gen 34, which tells of the actions of Simeon and Levi against Shechem, the son of Hamor and against all the inhabitants of his town, whom they put to the sword when they were suffering the pain of circumcision most, as a consequence of the rape of Dinah. Or the strange story of Exod 4:24–26, where Zipporah circumcises her son who had not yet been circumcised, even though he was the son of Moses, so saving her "bridegroom of blood" from death. In Jewish literature, stories about the circumcision of Abraham multiplied enormously and chapter 29 of *Pirqe Rabbi Eliezer* includes quite a number of them.[34] Thus, in a gloss on Gen 18:1, *Targum Neophyti* states that Abraham "was seated at the door of his tent in the hottest part of the day, warming himself by the blood of circumcision in the heat of the day" and not because he was lazy or he wanted to take a siesta. Or *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* on Exod 12:13 notes that "the blood of the Passover sacrifice and of the cut of circumcision will be mixed to make it a sign over the house where you live."

In version A of the *Avot of Rabbi Nathan* 2:10 we have a list of patriarchs who were born already circumcised, each case supported by a quotation from Scripture.[35] The list begins with Job, of whom it says: "If it is so, why does Scripture add *just and perfect man*? Merely to show that Job was born circumcised." The list includes patriarchs earlier than Abraham, such as Adam, Seth, Noah, and Shem (identified with Melchizedek) who are born circumcised because they are perfect also; but it also includes

[34] Pérez Fernández, *Los Capítulos de Rabbi Eliezer*, 201–8.

[35] See the translation of the text in M. A. Navarro Peiró, *Abot de Rabbi Natán* (BMidr 5; Valencia: S. Jerónimo, 1967), 55. There is a similar list in *Tanḥuma*, Noah 5.

Jacob, Joseph, Moses, and even the evil Balaam, as well as Samuel, David, Jeremiah, and Zerubabel for other reasons. In the case of patriarchs earlier than Abraham, the quotations refer to the use of the word "perfect" in the biblical text when it speaks of them; as *Pirqe Rabbi Eliezer* explains, perfect can only be one who is circumcised:

> When Abraham was ninety-nine years old, the Holy One, blessed be he, said to him: "Walk in my presence and be perfect" (Gen 17:1). The Holy One, blessed be he, meant to say to him: Until now you were not perfect in my presence, but circumcise the flesh of your foreskin and then you shall walk in my presence and be perfect. (*Pirqe R. El.* 29:1)[36]

However, undoubtedly the continual wish in rabbinic tradition to extend the perfect fulfilment of Mosaic law to all the patriarchs and to portray them as models plays an important role in making them born already circumcised.[37] The *Book of Jubilees* uses this argument explicitly in describing the law about circumcision on the eighth day after birth not as a Mosaic law but as a law written on the heavenly tablets since eternity.[38] *Jubilees* 15:23–26 tells us:

> Abraham did as the Lord told him. He took his son Ishmael, everyone who was born in his house and who had been purchased with money—every male who was in his house—and circumcised the flesh of their foreskins. On the same day Abraham was circumcised; [those who were born in his house], the men of his household, and all those who had been purchased with money (even from foreigners) were circumcised with him. This law is (valid) for all history forever. There is no circumcising of days, nor omitting any day of the eight days because it is an eternal ordinance ordained and written on the heavenly tablets. Anyone who is born, the flesh of whose private parts has not been circumcised by the eighth day does not belong to the people of the pact which the Lord made with Abraham but to the people (meant for) destruction. Moreover, there is no sign on him that he belongs to the Lord, but (he is meant) for destruction, for being destroyed from the earth, and for being uprooted from the earth because he has violated the covenant of the Lord our God.

---

[36] Pérez Fernández, *Los Capítulos de Rabbi Eliezer*, 201.

[37] Perhaps the idea that the foreskin is particularly impure also played a role, as the 1544 Venice edition tells us in a gloss on *Pirqe R. El.* 29:1, also preserved in manuscripts Casanatiensia 1.VI.I and Casanatiensia 10.IV.I, where we read: "For the foreskin is the most impure of all impure things—as it says: 'For the circumcised and the unclean shall never enter you again' (Isa 52:1)—and the most wicked of all wicked things. So circumcise the flesh of your foreskin, walk in my presence and be perfect." Cf. Pérez Fernández, *Los Capítulos de Rabbi Eliezer*, 201 note b.

[38] On the heavenly tablets in *Jubilees* see my contribution, "The Heavenly Tablets in the *Book of Jubilees*" (ch. 4, below), and more recently H. Najman, "Interpretation as Primordial Writing: *Jubilees* and its Authority Conferring Strategies," *JSJ* 30 (1999): 379–410.

A little further on, in *Jub.* 15:28–34, it specifies:

> Now you command the Israelites to keep the sign of this covenant throughout their history as an eternal ordinance so that they may not be uprooted from the earth because the command has been ordained as a covenant so that they should keep it forever on all the Israelites. For the Lord did not draw near to himself either Ishmael, his sons, his brothers, or Esau. He did not choose them (simply) because they were among Abraham's children, for he knew them. But he chose Israel to be his people. He sanctified them and gathered (them) from all mankind. For there are many nations and many peoples and all belong to him. He made spirits rule over all in order to lead them astray from following him. But over Israel he made no angel or spirit rule because he alone is their ruler. He will guard them and require them for himself from his angels, his spirits, and everyone, and all his powers so that he may guard them and bless them and so that they may be his and he theirs from now and forever. I am now telling you that the Israelites will prove false to this ordinance. They will not circumcise their sons in accord with this entire law because they will leave some of the flesh of their circumcision when they circumcise their sons. All the people of Belial will leave their sons uncircumcised just as they were born. Then there will be great anger from the Lord against the Israelites because they neglected his covenant, departed from his word, provoked, and blasphemed in that they did not perform the ordinance of this sign. For they have made themselves like the nations so as to be removed and uprooted from the earth. They will no longer have forgiveness or pardon so that they should be pardoned and forgiven for every sin, for (their) violation of this eternal (ordinance).

However the strangest statement in this text, to which I have referred once or twice, is verse 27, which in the Ethiopic text reads as follows:

> For this is what the nature of all the angels of the presence and all the angels of holiness was like from the day of their creation. In front of the angels of the presence and the angels of holiness he sanctified Israel to be with him and his holy angels. (*Jub.* 15:27)[39]

So the Ethiopic text clearly states that two types of angels, the angels of the face (or the angels of the presence, which is the usual translation) and the holy angels (or the angels of holiness; both forms occur in different manuscripts, both as a noun and as an adjective) have been created circumcised and this is their "nature" (or creation) from the day of their creation.

---

[39] For the Ethiopic text see J. C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Text* (CSCO 510; Scriptores Aethiopici 87; Leuven: Peeters, 1989).

The Latin translation of *Jubilees*, partly conserved in C 73, a palimpsest from the Ambrosian Library of Milan published by Ceriani,[40] has a slightly different text from which the circumcision of angels is missing. The Latin text is:

> Quoniam omnis[41] angeli uultuus et omnes archangeli benedictionis a diebus creaturae ipsorum coram angelorum uultuus[42] et angelorum sanctificationis sanctificauit israhel ut esset simul cum ipso et cum angelis sanctorum ipsius.

Which can be translated:

> Because all the angels of the face and all the archangels of blessing from the days of their creation; before the angels of the face and the angels of sanctification he sanctified Israel so that it could be together with Him and with the angels of his holy places.[43]

If we compare the two surviving versions of the text,[44] a series of differences is immediately obvious. In the Ethiopic version there are two classes of circumcised angels: the angels of the presence and the angels of holiness (the two categories of angels named first at the moment of their creation, who in *Jub.* 2:18 are referred to as "these two great classes," that is, of a class superior to the other heavenly beings); as Charles notes,[45] these two classes are the two classes of angels that in the same text (*Jub.* 2:18) receive the privileged order to observe the Sabbath. In the Ethiopic version, both categories of angels are repeated in the two parts of the clause. Instead, in the Latin version, the angelic categories named are three (or four): *angeli uultuus* (who correspond to the angels of the presence

[40] A. M. Ceriani, *Monumenta sacra et profana* I 1 (Milan: Bibliotheca Ambrosiana, 1861), 9–64. The Latin text has been re-published several times, with slight differences. It is available in H. Rönsch, *Das Buch der Jubiläen oder die Kleine Genesis* (Leipzig: Fues, 1874; repr. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1970), 14.

[41] Read *omnes*.

[42] Read *uultuum*.

[43] For this translation of "angelis sanctorum ipsius" see Rönsch, *Das Buch der Jubiläen*, 101.

[44] Unfortunately, our text has not been preserved among the numerous fragments of the different copies of the Hebrew original of *Jubilees* found in Qumran. See the detailed list in VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, x. Nor is our text preserved in the Syriac version or in the quotations from the Greek translation that have come down to us.

[45] R. H. Charles, *The Book of Jubilees or the Little Genesis. Translated from the Editor's Ethiopic Text* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1902), 111: "The two orders mentioned here in the Ethiopic text are the same two who are said to unite with God and with Israel in observing the Sabbath (ii, 18, 19, 21). The inferior angels of service did not enjoy this privilege. Now just as the highest angels have shared with Israel in the privilege of the Sabbath, so they shared also in the privilege of circumcision."

in the Ethiopic version), *archangeli benedictionis* (who correspond to the angels of holiness), *angeli sanctificationis* (which is an acceptable translation of the angels of holiness) and *angeli sanctorum ipsius* (which seems to be a summary of the various classes of angel mentioned).

However, in my opinion the most striking difference is the absence of angelic circumcision in the Latin text. In the Latin text, the first sentence seems to be truncated and the detail "they have this nature (or creation)" is missing. VanderKam,[46] who translates verse 17: "For this is what the nature of the angels of the presence and all the angels of holiness was like from the day of their creation. In front of the angels of the presence and the angels of holiness he sanctified Israel to be with him and his holy angels," indicates the omission in a note and explains: "This is . . . was like: Latin omits. Possibly the two instances of 'creation' in Ethiopic triggered the omission." However, this explanation does not seem completely convincing to me, since there is only one other word between the two occurrences of "creation" in the Ethiopic text. It would seem more logical to suppose that the Latin translator (or the Greek on which the Latin translation depends) has shortened the text specifically to omit this strange statement about angelic masculinity, which could seem offensive in some circles. Therefore the text is now slightly truncated, but it is more in line with the "spiritualisation" of angels that is stressed in other texts, as we have seen.

In the Ethiopic text, which the copies found in Qumran have amply shown to be faithful to the Hebrew original, this masculinity is presented in an emphatic manner: the two superior classes of angels are portrayed as males, definitely without an impure foreskin, since they were created (already) circumcised, but definitely with a masculine sex.

---

[46] VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees: Translation*, 92.

CHAPTER THREE

GEOGRAPHY AS THEOLOGY: FROM THE *BOOK OF JUBILEES* TO THE *PHALEG* BY ARIAS MONTANO

Introduction

In honour of my friend Jesús Peláez, and as a souvenir of our many trips through the land of Palestine (to explore the land or to visit the tombs of Maimonides and of Rabbi Akiva), I have found nothing better than a journey through the mythical geographies of some works known to be ancient (such as *Jubilees*, the *Genesis Apocryphon*, or the *Jewish Antiquities* of Flavius Josephus), others of more debatable antiquity (such as *Targum Neofiti*), and even a geographical treatise from the Renaissance period (the *Phaleg* by Arias Montano), examining how these texts interpret the ethnographical data of the so-called "table of the nations" of Gen 10 in geographical terms. This survey proves that the data of the biblical text were brought up to date and read in the light of the geographical knowledge of later periods. But in the case of the ancient interpretations in *Jubilees* and the *Genesis Apocryphon*, the text of Genesis is completely reinterpreted in terms of the theology peculiar to these works.

Clearly we have to begin by reminding ourselves of what this chapter of Genesis says.[1] Although in Gen 10:1 the names of the sons of Noah appear in the traditional sequence: Shem, Ham and Japheth, the list of their descendants is in the reverse order: Japheth (10:2–5), Ham (10:6–20) and Shem (10:21–31), a detail that is significant, as we shall see. The three sections devoted to each of the sons of Noah end with three summaries, using similar wording, which tells us the geographical range of the genealogies: "From these, by branching out, the islands of the nations were peopled in their lands, each according to their language and according to their families within their nations" (10:5); "These are the sons of Ham according to their families and languages, by their countries and nations"

[1] For the biblical text I generally use the spelling of proper names as in the NRSV. In quotations from other documents, I use the spellings of the various translators. Unfortunately, this chapter of Genesis has not been preserved in the 15 manuscripts of Genesis found in Qumran, or among the manuscripts found at Masada, Murabba'at and Sdeir.

(10:20); "These are the sons of Shem according to their families and languages, by their countries and nations" (10:31). The chapter ends with a summary explaining the purpose of the narrative: "These are, according to their genealogies and nations, the families of the sons of Noah; from these the nations scattered over the earth after the flood" (10:32).

To summarise,[2] according to the Masoretic text of Gen 10, the three families multiplied and expanded in the following manner:[3]

– Japheth has 7 sons: Gomer, Magog, Madai, Javan, Tubal, Meshech, and Tiras,[4] from two of which comes the lineage: (1) Gomer (Ashkenaz, Riphath, and Togarmah) and (2) Javan (Elishah, Tarshish, Kittim, and Dodanim).[5]
– Ham has 4 sons: Cush, Egypt, Put, and Canaan; from three of these sons comes the lineage: (1) Cush (Seba, Havilah, Sabtah, Raamah—from whom come Sheba and Dedan—, Sabteca, and Nimrod, whose history is recounted in some detail in 10:8–12 and about whom the LXX adds that he was "the first giant upon the earth"); (2) Egypt (the Lydians, the Anamites, the Lehabites, the Naphtuhites, the Pathrusites, the Casluhites, from whom come the Philistines, and the Caphtorites);[6] (3) Canaan (Sidon, Heth, the Jebusite, the Amorite, the Girgashite, the Hivite, the Arkite, the Sinite, the Arvadite, the Zemarite, and the Hamathite; Gen 10:18 specifies that "afterwards the Canaanite families spread" and 10:19 gives their borders: "The border of the Canaanite went from Sidon towards Gerar, as far as Gaza, and towards Sodom, Gomorrah, Adamah and Seboyim, as far as Lasha").

---

[2] For an interpretation of the biblical text, see, for example, C. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11: A Commentary* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1984). On the structure of Gen 10:1–32 see J. T. A. G. M. van Ruiten, *Primeval History Interpreted: The Rewriting of Genesis 1–11 in the Book of Jubilees* (JSJSup 66; Brill: Leiden, 2000), 287–90.

[3] Note that in the purely genealogical sections attributed to P by critics, the name of the ancestor or eponym is given, whereas in the sections attributed to J, the names of the peoples are mentioned and geographical details are given. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11*, 502, summarised the situation as follows: "The J-texts in Gen 10 describe more an *event*—how humankind spread over the earth and became the nations that they now are. Instead, the P-texts, following the basic line of P, describe a *situation*—the state of being nations as a result of the spread of humankind over the earth."

[4] In LXX Gen 10:2, Japeth is given another son: Elishah, a name that recurs as the son of Javan in Gen 10:3.

[5] Read Rodoi in the LXX.

[6] In LXX Gen 10:14, the Philistines and the Caphtorim come from the Casluhim.

– Shem (who is said to be the ancestor of all the sons of Eber)[7] has 5 sons: Elam, Asshur, Arpachshad, Lud, and Aram, to which the LXX in Gen 10:22 adds one more: Kainan. The text gives, in this sequence, the lineages of (1) Aram (Uz, Hul, Gether, and Mash), and of (2) Arpachshad, the second in more detail: (Arpachshad sired Shelah,[8] who sired Eber, from whom were born Peleg and Joktan); from Joktan come, also in detail, both the descendants (Almodad, Sheleph, Hazarmaveth, Jerah, Hadoram, Uzal, Diklah, Obal,[9] Abimael, Sheba, Ophir, Havilah, and Jobab), and their place of residence ("from Mesha as you go to Sephar, to the mountain of the east").

This division and occupation of the land by Noah's descendants after the flood would continue to be adapted in order to update it with the geographical and ethnographical knowledge of the various periods, and for many centuries would provide the foundation for the expression of geographical knowledge.

---

[7] The Hebrew text in Gen 10:21 is ambiguous: אחי יפת הגדול "brother of Japheth the elder" could be understood either in the sense that Shem is the firstborn or, as generally accepted in Jewish tradition, Japheth is the firstborn, as in the LXX, which uses μείζων in the superlative: ἀδελφῷ Ιαφεθ τοῦ μείζονος, "brother of Japheth, the eldest."

[8] In Gen 10:23 the LXX adds an additional rung in the genealogy, since Arpachshad begot Kainan who begot Selah, a rung which is therefore reflected in Gen 11:13 (LXX). In *Jub.* 8:1–8 there is an identical genealogy: Arpachshad–Kainan–Shelah–Eber–Peleg, with the addition of the names of their respective wives and the dates when their sons were born: "And on the twenty-ninth jubilee in the first week, at its beginning Arpachshad took a wife and her name was Rasu'eya, daughter of Susan, daughter of Elam, as a wife. And she bore a son for him in the third year of that week, and he called him Cainan . . . he took a wife and her name was Melka, daughter of Madai, son of Japheth. And in its fourth year he begot a son, and he called him Shelah, because, he said, 'I have certainly been sent out.' And in the fourth week Shelah was born and he grew up. And he took a wife and her name was Muak, daughter of Kesed, his father's brother, as a wife in the thirty-first jubilee in the fifth week in the first year. She bore a son for him in its fifth year, and he called him Eber. And he took a wife, and her name was 'Azurad, daughter of Nebrod, in the thirty-second jubilee, in the seventh week in its third year. And in its sixth year she bore a son for him. And he called him Peleg because in the days when he was born the sons of Noah began dividing up the earth for themselves. Therefore he called him Peleg." Translations of *Jubilees* are in part taken from O. S. Wintermute in *OTP*, and are in part an English rendering of the Spanish translation of F. Corriente and A. Piñero, "Libro de los Jubileos" in *Apócrifos del Antiguo Testamento II* (ed. A. Díez Macho; Madrid: Cristiandad, 1983), 81–188.

[9] In 10:28 the LXX omits Obal.

1. Flavius Josephus, *Neofiti I* and the *Phaleg* of Arias Montano

In the first book of his *Jewish Antiquities*, the Jewish historian Josephus brings Gen 10 up to date,[10] giving the identifications of places and peoples mentioned that were current in his time, which he considers to be perfectly legitimate since he considered that the Greeks introduced these changes.[11]

In spite of some inconsistencies in the locations he proposes,[12] Josephus basically follows the biblical text (it begins with Japheth, followed by Ham and finally comes Shem), although insisting on the purely geographical aspects. Before describing the locations of the peoples in detail and their equivalences with the peoples known by the Greeks, Josephus provides a description of the territory occupied by each of Noah's three sons: "In fact, Japheth, son of Noah, had seven sons. These began to inhabit the lands from Mount Taurus and Mount Amanus, to reach Asia as far as the river Tanais (the present-day Don, considered in antiquity as the frontier between Asia and Europe) and in Europe as far as Cadiz (ἕως Γαδείρων), occupying the lands they came across and as nobody had previously lived in these places, called these peoples by their own names" (*Ant.* 1.122). "The sons of Ham took the lands going from Syria and Mount Amanus and Mount Lebanon, occupying all the regions facing the sea in this region and making their own all the lands that extend as far as the Ocean" (*Ant.* 1.130). "To Shem, the third of Noah's sons, five sons were born, who lived in the

---

[10] *Ant.* 1.120–147. See the Greek text of the edition by B. Niese, *Flavii Iosephi opera* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1892) and the translation of José Vara Donado, *Antigüedades judías* (Madrid: Akal, 2002). On the interpretation of Gen 10 by Josephus, see the monograph by T. W. Franxman, *Genesis and the "Jewish Antiquities" of Flavius Josephus* (BibOr 35; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1979), 100–116 and the notes to the new translation by L. H. Feldman in Brill's series, *Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary, Volume 3: Judean Antiquities, Books 1–4* (CFJ 3; Leiden: Brill, 1999).

[11] "And some nations preserve the names given by their founders, whereas others have changed them, and there are those who replaced the old one with another that seemed clearer to their neighbours. It is the Greeks who are really responsible for this change (Ἕλληνες δ' εἰσὶν οἱ τούτου καταστάντες αἴτιοι), for by imposing their power on later populations they also appropriated their past glories, adorning those peoples with names that became unintelligble and establishing in them norms of behaviour for the citizens as if they had descended from the Greeks themselves" (*Ant.* 1.120–121).

[12] For example, the Medes, the descendants of Maday, are in the territory of Shem, not of Japheth: "Since it refers to the sons of Japheth, Javan and Mad, we have to say that from the latter comes the people of the Madaeans, called Medes by the Greeks (καὶ Μάδου ἀπὸ μὲν τούτου Μαδαῖοι γίνονται ἔθνος, οἳ πρὸς Ἑλλήνων Μῆδοι κέκληνται)" (*Ant.* 1.124), whereas the Lydians, descendants of Lud, dwell in the territory of Japheth: "And those called Lydians (Λυδοὺς) today and the Ludians (Λούδιος), founded Lud (Λούδας)" (*Ant.* 1.145).

region of Asia that extends as far as the Indian ocean, after leaving the Euphrates" (*Ant.* 1.143). These summaries make it clear that Josephus is inspired by Greek cartographic conceptions, captured in the Ionian map of the *oecumene*, which divides the world into three continents—Europe, Asia and Africa—separated by the Don and the Nile and surrounded by the circular ocean.[13] This tripartite division of the world has the following boundaries: Japheth's part is bounded to the south by Mount Taurus and Mount Amanus,[14] to the east by the Don and to the west by Cadiz; Ham's part is bounded by Mount Amanus and Mount Lebanon to the north and extends through Syria as far as the Mediterranean and north Africa to the west; Shem's part is bounded by the Euphrates and Syria to the west and extends through Asia as far as the Indian ocean. The descendants of Ham, as in the biblical text, occupy the regions of Canaan[15] and Palestine,[16] whereas the descendants of Shem are clearly located in the regions of the Euphrates[17] and in Asia.[18]

We find a similar updating to the one made by Josephus in the Aramaic translation preserved in *Targum Neofiti*, which depends closely on the biblical text it translates, restricting itself to updating the source text in line with the geographical knowledge of the time. According to Díez Macho, the toponymic details of the Targum indicate the geography of the Roman period: "there are names that are much older, there are names that would

---

[13] On the Ionian map of the world, see G. Hölscher, *Drei Erdkarten: Ein Beitrag zur Erdkenntnis des hebraïschen Altertums* (Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophische-historische Klasse 1944/48; Heidelberg: Winter, 1949), 57–73.

[14] A mountain range in Asia Minor. Franxman, *Genesis and the "Jewish Antiquities,"* 102, suggests that, under the influence of Strabo, Josephus connected the Taurus with the Amanus.

[15] "Canaan, the fourth son of Ham (Χαναναῖος δὲ τέταρτος ὢν Χάμου παῖς), colonised the country now called Judaea (Ἰουδαίαν), which he called Cananea (Χαναναίαν), in agreement with his own name" (*Ant.* 1.135).

[16] "Of the eight sons that Merseo had, they occupied all the lands that go from Gaza to Egypt, but the region has only kept the name Philistia (Φυλιστίνου), since the Greeks call the sector that he occupied Palestine (Παλαιστίνην)" (*Ant.* 1.137).

[17] "In fact, on his death Elim left the Elimaeans, the predecessors of the Persians. Assur founded the city of Nino and gave the name Assyrians to its subjects, who were extremely fortunate. Arpachshad gave the name Arpachshadites to those called Chaldaeans today, whose founder he was. Aram had the Aramaeans, whom the Greeks call Syrians . . . Of the sons of Aram, who numbered four, Us occupied the Traconitis and Damascus, located between Palestine and Coelesyria, Ur (occupied) Armenia, Geter (occupied) Bactriana and Mes (occupied) Mesena, the Espasino Carx of today" (*Ant.* 1.145–146).

[18] "To Juctan, the other son of Heber, were born Elmodad, Salef, Azermot, Ira, Edoram, Uzal, Dacles, Ebal, Abimael, Safas, Ophir, Evil and Jobel. These, leaving the river Cofen, dwelt in several territories of India (Ἰνδικῆς) and neighbouring Seria (Σηρίας)" (*Ant.* 1.147).

continue to be used in much later centuries; however, as a whole it seems to be the geography of this period."[19] For Díez Macho, these geographical details are one of the clearest indications of the antiquity of this Aramaic translation.[20] As indications of this geography of the Roman period, Díez Macho chooses the names of Africa, Germany, Media, Macedonia, Bythinia, Mysia, and Thrace in Gen 10:2; of Asia, Hyrcania, and Barbaria in Gen 10:3; of Allas (= Hellas, probably understood as *Magna Graecia*), Tarshish (perhaps Tares = Taranto or Tarsus, as in the margin of *Neofiti*), Italy, and Dardania (a district of upper Mysia) in Gen 10:4; of Arabia, Egypt, Allihroq (the name of a heptarchy in Egypt, probably Heracleotes), and Canaan in Gen 10:6; of the Sirinaean peoples, Indians, Semarae, Libyans, Zingitans (the inhabitants of the region of Zeugitana in Africa), Mauritanians, Zemargards, and Mazices (or Mazyes in north Africa) in Gen 10:7, and lastly the reference to Babylonia and Edessa in Gen 10:10.[21] Although the early date that Díez Macho ascribes to the Targum has been very much discussed, there is absolutely no doubt that the geography of the biblical text has been brought up to date in the Aramaic translation.

These updates of the text of Genesis in the light of advances in geographical knowledge were very common over the centuries,[22] increasingly so during the Renaissance period, under the impulse of new discoveries. A perfect example is provided by the scholar Arias Montano from Seville, especially in his treatise *Phaleg*, an exegetical and geographical commentary on Gen 10, dated May, 1572 and included in the seventh volume of the Antwerp Polyglot.[23]

---

[19] A. Díez Macho, *Neophyti 1: Tomo 1: Génesis* (TECC 7; Madrid: CSIC, 1968), 72*.

[20] A. Díez Macho, "The Recently Discovered Palestinian Targum: Its Antiquity and Relationship with Other Targums," in *Congress Volume, Oxford 1959: Papers Read at the Third Congress of the International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament* (VTSup 7; Leiden: Brill, 1960), 222–45; idem, "In torno a la datación del Targum palestinense," *Sef* 20 (1960): 3–16 and in the general introduction to the edition of *Neofiti*, 57*–95*.

[21] Díez Macho, "The Recently Discovered Palestinian Targum," 228.

[22] For example, in his *Questiones Hebraicae in Libro Geneseos*, Jerome tries to apply his geographical knowledge to explain the name and the territories of the sons of Noah, although he is not always successful. For example, when discussing Gen 10:12 he says: "exceptis Labaim, a quibus Libyes postea nominati sunt, qui prius Futhei vocabantur, et Chasloim, qui deincepts Philistiim appellati sunt, quos nos corrupte Palaestinos dicimus, ceterae sex gentes ignota nobis sunt" and on the sons of Yoqṭan he comments dispiritedly: "harum gentium posteriora nomina invenire non potui." I use the edition by P. A. de Lagarde (Leipzig: Teubner, 1868) in which the section on Gen 10 is on pp. 14–18.

[23] *Phaleg, sive de gentium sedibus primis, orbisque terrae situ, liber.* Benedicto Aria Montano hispalensi auctore, Antverpiae, Excudebat Christophorus Plantinus Prototypographus Regius, ad sacri Apparatus instructionem. Anno MDLXXII.

On the second page of the introduction to his treatise, in the Preface to the reader printed in italics, Arias Montano explains that the discovery of the New World helps us to understand what Sacred Scripture says.[24] Taking as an example the location of the land of Ophir, he states that nothing Greek or Roman writers say which has reached us can be compared with what Moses says and what is written in the books of Kings and Chronicles.[25] Arias Montano identifies Ophir, called *Parwaim*, with Peru, or more precisely, with the two regions called Peru, known as Peru and Hispaniola or *Nueva España* (New Spain), from which the purest gold comes.[26] This identification allows Arias Montano to dispute the interpretation of Jerome—whom he calls "interpres quidem"—who translated the Hebrew phrase והזהב זהב פרוים incorrectly as "Et aurum erat probatissimum." The correct translation, according to this Hebrew scholar from Seville, should be "Et aurum illud, aurum PERU, et PERU," since the dual of *peru* is *parwaim*.[27]

In chapter 9 of the treatise *Phaleg*, where Arias Montano discusses the third part of the earth—that is the section allocated to the sons of Shem—he repeats the identification of the land of Ophir as Peru, explaining how the descendants of Shem could have reached the New World. In describing his expansion towards the east, Arias Montano claims that Ophir went much further than the others, occupying alone the vast lands extending towards the Levant along the great abyss.[28] He led his peoples

---

[24] "Quae nuper ab Hispanis navigantibus primum inventa esse creditur, noviisque orbis appellatur, ex ea, quae in sacris traditur libris, terrarum orbis descriptione, apertissime cognosci posse." *Phaleg*, A2 verso.

[25] "Nullus denique ex Graecis, Latinisve Scriptoribus, quorum scripta ad nostram usque pervenerunt aetatem, aliquid edidit, quod se, quale tamdem id sit, diligenter examinetur, comparari possit cum iis quae Moses de terra Ophir apertissime scriptsit, velque Ionathan Propheta, eius, quae est de Regibus Iudae, scriptor historiae, copiose ut exacte tradidit: aut cum iis, quae ab eo qui Paralipomena Spiritu Sancto dictante scripsit, disertis sunt descripta verbis." *Phaleg*, A2 verso.

[26] "Verum etiam terra illam, ex qua tanta optimi auri copia eliceretur, et ad alias gentes asportaretur, eam, inquam, terram, iam tum פרוים Paruaim appellatam esse, aperte docet. quae quidem dictio, iis qui vel tantum Hebraice sciunt legere, duas regiones, olim Peru dictas, clare demonstrat: unam quidem, quae eodem vocabulo, hodierno etiam die Peru dicitur: alteram vero, quae nova Hispania a navigantibus est appellata. Eius autem regionis aurum purissimum; atque in maximo pretio apud omnes gentes fuisse constat." *Phaleg*, A2 verso.

[27] "Atque Interpres quidem, vel ob ignotam sibi regionem, vel potius in eius, quod illa regio exhibebat, auri laudem; cum in Hebraeo ita scriptum legatur, וְהַזָּהָב זְהַב פַּרְוָיִם. i. Et aurum illud, aurum PERU, et PERU, nam פרו in numero duali פַּרְוָיִם dicitur: ille, inquam, convertit: Et aurum erat probatissimum." *Phaleg*, A2 verso.

[28] "Post hunc porro processit Ophir, latissimeque patentes terras, secundum abyssi magna littora ad Ortum extentus, solus obtinuit." *Phaleg*, 12, col. b.

and his name to the two regions separated by a long, narrow isthmus of land, which in the time of Solomon and afterwards had one name, Ophir, although later this name was used to denote two separate regions, each of which is called Peru, and since the noun is a dual, together they are called *Parwaim*.[29] Of course, once again the proof that Arias Montano uses is the huge amount of gold, precious stones and *'almuggim* in Peru.[30]

Arias Montano's treatise closes with some summary tables in which he notes names in Hebrew and in Latin, specifies the places of settlement and indicates their locations. The last four entries[31] of "Filiorum Aram Sedes," corresponding to the sons of Joktan, show most clearly how the discovery of America influenced Arias Montano's exegesis of the biblical text. Number 19 is on Ophir, called Peru when the Books of Chronicles were written.[32] Both numbers 21 deal with the peoples who descended from Joktan and the regions where they live: Yobab is the region of the New World called Parias,[33] and Sefar is the mountain range of the Andes, where the city of Yuctan is to be found, which preserves the name of the ancestor.[34]

It is clear that these three rereadings of the biblical text simply make it correspond to the geographical knowledge of the period of each author. Josephus used the knowledge circulated by Greek geographers. In the opinion of its editor Díez Macho, the Aramaic translation of *Neofiti* used knowledge current in the Roman world in the third century. And Arias Montano used the knowledge conveyed by the discovery of America in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

---

[29] "Porro Ophir, quem antea diximus, secundum abyssi magnae littora genus nomenque produxit suum, ad duas regiones angusto terrarum, sed longo isthmo interiecto distinctas, quae ad Salomonis usque atque ulteriora etiam tempora integrum retinuere vocabulum Ophir; quod paulo post inversum uttique etiam parti seorsum adscriptum est, atque alteruttra pars Peru; utraque autem simul dualis numeri pronuntiatione Peruaim sive Parvaim dicta est." *Phaleg*, 12, col. b.

[30] "Ophir omnis, sive utraque Peru regio, auro abundat plurimo; inde etiam ligna Almugim mirae in aedificiorum ornamentis pulchritudinis, et pretiosi lapidis magna affertur copia." *Phaleg*, 12, col. b.

[31] Although there are only three numbers, since number 21 is repeated. These tables have no page numbers.

[32] "Ophire sive Opire. Peru sic etiam dicta, quo tempore Paralipomenon historia conscripta est. 2. Paralip. 3. 6."

[33] "Iobab. Novi orbis dicti pars vocata regio PARIAS, auro margaritisque abundans."

[34] "Sepher mons. Longissimus omnium montium, qui hactenus in orbe visi sunt, a nostriis Andes dictur; in illa orbis antiquissima IUKTAN, quae nomen auctoris illius Gentis retinet."

2. The *Book of Jubilees* and the *Genesis Apocryphon*

Unlike those rereadings that simply tried to update the ethnographic content of Gen 10 using the geographical knowledge of the various periods, the two oldest interpretations we have of the biblical text (in the *Book of Jubilees* and in the *Genesis Apocryphon*), do not modernise the geographical names. Instead, they try to use the geographical knowledge of their time to reinterpret the biblical text considerably, imposing new theological ideas on it, thus transforming geography into theology.

The *Book of Jubilees* deals with the division of the earth among the three sons of Noah and his descendants in chapters 8 and 9,[35] chapters that in effect are maps. Already some elements of chapter 7, such as the contrast between the descendants of Shem and those of Ham, introduce the changes *Jubilees* made to the text of Gen 10. Thus, *Jub.* 7:13 clarifies the curse of Canaan: "Ham knew that his father cursed his youngest son, and it was disgusting to him that he cursed his son." And *Jub.* 7:16, after noting that Ham and Japheth are the ones who separate from Noah, adds: "And Shem dwelt with his father, Noah, and built a city near his father on the mountain. And he also named it after his wife: Sedeqetelebab."

Unlike the biblical text, which simply conveys the multiplication of Noah's sons over the earth after the flood after the death of Noah (as told in Gen 9:28–29) and is generally interested in ethnography, in *Jubilees* it is a real geographical distribution. More precisely, there are two, since according to *Jubilees* there is a first distribution related to the etymology of Peleg in Gen 10:25: "And in its sixth year she bore a son for him. And he called him Peleg because in the days when he was born the sons of Noah began dividing up the earth for themselves. Therefore he called him

[35] These chapters have not been preserved in any of the manuscripts of *Jubilees* found in Qumran. I use the edition of the Ethiopic text published by J. C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Text* (CSCO 510; Scriptores Aethiopici 87; Leuven: Peeters, 1989). Recent monographs on *Jubilees* include M. Segal, *The Book of Jubilees: Rewriten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology* (JSJSup 117; Leiden: Brill, 2007); J. M. Scott, *On Earth as in Heaven: The Restoration of Sacred Time and Sacred Space in the Book of Jubilees* (JSJSup 91; Leiden: Brill, 2005); idem, *Geography in Early Judaism and Christianity: The Book of Jubilees* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001); J. T. A. G. M. van Ruiten, *Primeval History Interpreted: The Rewriting of Genesis 1–11 in the Book of Jubilees* (JSJSup 66; Leiden, 2000). The important collection of studies on *Jubilees* edited by M. Albani, J. Frey, and A. Lange, *Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (TSAJ 65; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), contains two studies that are of interest for our topic: J. Frey, "Zum Weltbild in Jubiläenbuch," 261–92 and J. M. Scott, "The Division of the Earth in Jubilees 8:11–9:15 and Early Christian Chronography," 295–319. For a comprehensive overview of current research on this apocryphal book, see J. C. VanderKam, "Recent Scholarship on the Book of Jubilees," *CBR* 6 (2008): 405–31.

Peleg" as *Jub.* 8:8 tells us. But *Jub.* 8:9 immediately adds that this first distribution, at the end of a jubilee ("in the sixth year of the seventh week of the thirty-second jubilee"—the year 1567 according to the calculations of the book)—had not been good: "They divided it in an evil (manner) among themselves, and they told it to Noah." As a result, Noah takes matters into his own hands and proceeds to an orderly distribution, in the presence of an angel sent expressly for that purpose, effected by drawing lots to decide which section belonged to each as his inheritance. Here, *Jubilees* transposes to Noah the procedure used by Moses to distribute the land of Israel among the tribes (Num 26:52–56), adding that the lots are fixed in a text that acts as a witness:

> At the beginning of the thirty-third jubilee [1569–1617, according to the calculation of *Jubilees*] they divided the earth into three parts—for Shem, Ham, and Japheth—each in his own inheritance. (This happened) in the first year of the first week [1569] while one of us who were sent was staying with them. When he (i.e. Noah) summoned his children, they came to him—they and their children. He divided the earth into the lots which his three sons would occupy. They reached out their hands and took the book from the bosom of their father Noah. (*Jub.* 8:10–11)[36]

In respect of the biblical text, *Jubilees* inverts the sequence and begins the distribution of the earth with the lot of Shem. In addition, *Jubilees* attempts to define the boundaries exactly by indicating the geographical places that correspond to each lot. *Jubilees* defines Shem's lot as follows, to which he devotes the most space and deals with in the greatest detail:

> In the book there emerged as Shem's lot the center of the earth which he would occupy as an inheritance for him and for his children throughout the history of eternity: from the middle of the mountain range of Rafa, from the source of the water from the Tina River. His share goes toward the west through the middle of this river. One then goes until one reaches the water of the deeps from which this river emerges. This river emerges and pours its waters into the Me'at Sea. This river goes as far as the Great Sea. Everything to the north belongs to Japheth, while everything to the south belongs to Shem. It goes until it reaches Karas. This is in the bosom of the branch which faces southward. His share goes toward the Great Sea and goes straight until it reaches to the west of the branch that faces southward, for this is the sea whose name is the Branch of the Egyptian Sea. It turns from there southwards toward the mouth of the Great Sea on the shore of the waters. It goes toward the west of Afra and goes until it reaches the water

[36] Translations of *Jubilees* are from J. C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees: Translation* (CSCO 511; Scriptores Aethiopici 88; Leuven: Peeters, 1989).

> of the Gihon River and to the south of the Gihon's waters along the banks of this river. It goes eastward until it reaches the Garden of Eden, toward the south side of it—on the south and from the east of the entire land of Eden and of all the east. It turns to the east and comes until it reaches to the east of the mountain range named Rafa. Then it goes down toward the bank of the Tina River's mouth. This share emerged by lot for Shem and his children to occupy it forever, throughout history until eternity. Noah was very happy that this share had emerged for Shem and his children. He recalled everything that he had said in prophecy with his mouth, for he had said: "May the Lord, the God of Shem, be blessed, and may the Lord live in the places where Shem resides." (*Jub*. 8:12–18)

It is clear that the author has a theological interest, which he declares at the start: Shem's inheritance lies in the centre of the land and belongs to him and his descendants, in their own right and for ever. To describe the limits of this inheritance, as in the description of the lots of Ham and of Japheth, the author uses a precise cartographic style, describing the world as divided into three continents: Shem in the centre, Japheth to the north and Ham in the south. The frontiers are described in some detail, as the complete circuit of three large circles. In the case of Shem, the itinerary starts from the extreme east: from mount Rafa (the Ripeos mountains of Greek geography), following the river Tanais (the present-day Don) reaching Lake Meotica (the sea of Azov) and from there to the great sea (the Mediterranean). From there it goes south, following towards the west of Africa as far as the Gihon (the Nile), along which it continues until it reaches the Garden of Eden, which it skirts until it reaches Mount Rafa again and the mouth of the river Tina, thus completing the circle.

Ham's lot is described as follows:

> For Ham there emerged a second share toward the other side of the Gihon—toward the south—on the right side of the garden. It goes southward and goes to all the fiery mountains. It goes westward toward the Atel Sea; it goes westward until it reaches the Mauk Sea, everything that descends into which *is* destroyed. It comes to the north to the boundary of Gadir and comes to the shore of the sea waters, to the waters of the Great Sea, until it reaches the Gihon River. The Gihon River goes until it reaches the right side of the Garden of Eden. This is the land which emerged for Ham as a share which he should occupy for himself and his children forever throughout their generations until eternity. (*Jub*. 8:22–24)

In this case, the starting-point is the Gihon (the Nile), to the right of Eden, following towards the south by the mountains of fire (mentioned in the *1 En.* 18:6–10) and the Atel sea (the Atlantic), until it reached the borders of Cadiz, continuing along the Mediterranean coast as far as the Nile, and following it back to the starting-point, so completing the circle.

Japheth's lot is described in the third place:

> For Japheth there emerged a third share on the other side of the Tina River toward the north of the mouth of its waters. It goes toward the northeast, (toward) the whole area of Gog and all that is east of them. It goes due north and goes toward the mountains of Qelt, to the north and toward the Mauq Sea. It comes to the east of Gadir as far as the edge of the sea waters. It goes until it reaches the west of Fara. Then it goes back toward Aferag and goes eastward toward the water of the Me'at Sea. It goes to the edge of the Tina River toward the northeast until it reaches the bank of its waters toward the mountain range of Rafa. It goes around the north. This is the land that emerged for Japheth and his children as his hereditary share which he would occupy for himself and his children throughout their generations forever: five large islands and a large land in the north. However, it is cold while the land of Ham is hot. Now Shem's land is neither hot nor cold but it is a mixture of cold and heat. (*Jub.* 8:25–30)

The course of the third lot goes from the mouth of the Tanais and along the mountains of Rafa and the sea of Mauk to reach Cadiz. It continues along the coast of the Roman province of Africa, including the Mediterranean islands and along the sea of Azov and the river Tanais to return to its point of departure, its estuary.

In these three geographical routes of the map of the world in *Jubilees*, commentators[37] have acknowledged without difficulty the representation of the ancient Ionian map of the world, with its three continents surrounded by a circular ocean.[38] Shem's territory is in Asia, Ham's is in Africa and Japheth's is in Europe. The three continents are surrounded by the Atlantic to the south (the sea of Atel), and by the circular ocean (the sea of Mauk) to the north. The major difference from the Ionian map is that the centre of the world (the navel of the earth) has been shifted from Delphi to Zion,[39] as is clear in the description of Shem's portion:

---

[37] Following Hölscher, *Drei Erdkarten*, 57–63. Studies specifically on *Jub.* 8:11–9:15, include P. S. Alexander, "Notes on the 'Imago Mundi' of the Book of Jubilees," *JJS* 33 (1982): 197–213; F. Schmidt, "Naissance d'une géographie juive," in *Moïse Géographe: Recherches sur les représentations juives et chrétiennes de l'espace* (ed. A. Desreumaux and F. Schmidt; Paris: Vrin, 1988), 13–30; J. C. VanderKam, "Putting them in their Place: Geography as an Evaluative Tool," in *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday* (ed. J. C. Reeves and J. Kampen; JSOTSup 184; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 46–69; J. Frey, "Zum Weltbild in Jubiläenbuch." Hölscher (p. 58), Alexander (p. 213) and Schmidt (pp. 20–23) provide drawings of the map of the world of *Jubilees*.

[38] Alexander, "Notes on the 'Imago Mundi'," 197, even suggests that this map was once part of the original manuscript.

[39] P. S. Alexander, "Jerusalem as the *Omphalos* of the World: On the History of a Geographical Concept," in *Jerusalem: Its Sanctity and Centrality to Judaism, Christianity and Islam* (ed. L. I. Levine; New York: Continuum, 1999), 104–19.

> Noah was very happy that this share had emerged for Shem and his children. He recalled everything that he had said in prophecy with his mouth, for he had said: "May the Lord, the God of Shem, be blessed, and may the Lord live in the places where Shem resides." He knew that the Garden of Eden is the holy of holies and is the residence of the Lord; (that) Mt. Sinai is in the middle of the desert; and (that) Mt. Zion is in the middle of the navel of the earth. The three of them—the one facing the other—were created as holy (places). He blessed the God of gods, who had placed the word of the Lord in his mouth and (he blessed) the Lord forever. He knew that a blessed and excellent share had come about for Shem and his children throughout the history of eternity: all the land of Eden, all the land of the Erythrean Sea, all the land of the east, India, (that which is) in Erythrea and its mountains, all the land of Bashan, all the land of Lebanon, the islands of Caphtor, the entire mountain range of Sanir and Amana, the mountain range of Asshur which is in the north, all the land of Elam, Asshur, Babylon, Susan, and Madai; all the mountains of Ararat, all the area on the other side of the sea which is on the other side of the mountain range of Asshur toward the north—a blessed and spacious land. Everything in it is very beautiful. (*Jub.* 8:18–21)

In *Jub.* 9 the sons of Noah distribute the territories that fell to them among their descendants, also by lot, beginning with Ham (9:1), followed by Shem (9:2–6) and ending with Japheth (9:7–13). It is in this apportioning of the land among the descendants of the sons of Noah that *Jubilees* shows most clearly its geographical knowledge, which is used to prove that the lots of the descendants are in each and every one of the three regions assigned to the three sons of Noah (note that Canaan is allotted the remotest part to the west of Africa, on the sea coast). The boundaries thus established are permanent and inviolable, something that Noah guarantees, obliging all to swear their agreement, to avoid divine punishment:

> In this way Noah's sons divided (the earth) for their sons in front of their father Noah. He made (them) swear by oath to curse each and every one who wanted to occupy the share which did not emerge by his lot. All of them said: "So be it!" So be it for them and their children until eternity during their generations until the day of judgment on which the Lord God will punish them with the sword and fire because of all the evil impurity of their errors by which they have filled the earth with wickedness, impurity, fornication, and sin. (*Jub.* 9:14–15)

His task complete, Noah could die in peace, as narrated by *Jub.* 10:15–17. However, not all his descendants were faithful to the solemn oath pronounced. When describing the dispersion of the peoples to the places allotted to them, *Jubilees* adds:

> Ham and his sons went into the land which he was to occupy, which he had acquired as his share, in the southern country. When Canaan saw that

> the land of Lebanon as far as the stream of Egypt was very beautiful, he did not go to his hereditary land to the west of the sea. He settled in the land of Lebanon, on the east and west, from the border of Lebanon and on the seacoast. His father Ham and his brothers Cush and Mizraim said to him: "You have settled in a land which was not yours and did not emerge for us by lot. Do not act this way, for if you do act this way both you and your children will fall in the land and be cursed with rebellion, because you have settled in rebellion and in rebellion your children will fall and be uprooted forever. Do not settle in Shem's residence because it emerged by their lot for Shem and his sons. You are cursed and will be cursed more than all of Noah's children through the curse by which we obligated ourselves with an oath before the holy judge and before your father Noah." But he did not listen to them. He settled in the land of Lebanon—from Hamath to the entrance of Egypt—he and his sons until the present. For this reason that land was named the land of Canaan. (*Jub.* 10:28–34)

This element, of which there is no trace at all in the book of Genesis, fully explains the theological interest *Jubilees* has in its geographical corrections to the "table of nations" in Gen 10.[40] The author of *Jubilees* is interested in showing that Canaan has no right to Palestine, that his occupation is based on usurping the territory allocated to the descendants of Shem, and that this usurpation of the rights of the descendants of Shem is null and void and is condemned by the curse of Ham, which specifies the curse that Noah had called down on Canaan in Gen 9:27. According to *Jubilees*, Israel, a descendant of Shem, has perpetual rights to the holy land, the navel of the world, which includes Eden, Sinai and Mount Sion, and Canaan, twice cursed, has no right to this land.[41]

We find a similar interpretation of Gen 10 in cols. 16–17 of the *Genesis Apocryphon* from Cave 1 of Qumran, which is very badly preserved, but now better known thanks to the excellent photographs taken by G. Bearman and K. and B. Zuckerman. It is accessible in Inscriptifact and in the

---

[40] In *Jubilees* there is another example that does not respect the assigned borders, but in this case it is due to negotiation not usurpation so it does not incur the curse. It is Madai (a descendant of Japheth), who settles in the portion allotted to the descendants of Shem: "And Madai saw the land of the sea and and did not like it. After asking Elam, Ashur and Arphachshad, his wife's brothers, he remained in the land of the Medes, close to his in-laws, until this day. He called his residence and that of his sons Media, from the name Madai, their father" (*Jub.* 10:36).

[41] See in detail VanderKam, "Putting them in their Place," 66–69, who refers to disputes over the right to the land of Canaan in later writings such as *Gen. Rab.* 61:6, *b. Sanh.* 91a, Procopius, *De bello vandalico* 4.10, 13–22 (who explains the expansion of Phoenician colonies over the Mediterranean as the result of Joshua's conquests).

new edition by D. Machiela.[42] An examination of these damaged columns suggests that the *Genesis Apocryphon* is even more interested than *Jubilees* in proving that only Israel has the right to the promised land.[43]

Already in column 3 of the *Genesis Apocryphon*, Enoch announces that Noah "is the one who will divide up the whole earth,"[44] which could be an echo of Gen 10:25 as Fitzmyer suggests.[45] However, it clearly anticipates what Noah will do in col. 16. In col. 7, Noah is presented as having authority "over the earth and all that is in it, over the seas and over the mountains."[46] And in col. 11, after leaving the ark, Noah traverses the land in all directions: "Then I, Noah, left and walked over the length and breadth of the earth."[47] As Fitzmyer notes,[48] Noah's walk is connected with what col. 21 says about Abraham immediately before he receives the promise of the land.[49]

In the *Genesis Apocryphon*, the order in which the land is distributed among the sons of Noah is different from the order in the biblical text (Japheth, Ham, Shem) and from the order in *Jubilees* (Shem, Ham, Japheth). The manuscript begins the distribution of land with Japheth's portion, followed by Shem's, although the boundaries of these parts have not been preserved completely:

---

[42] D. Machiela, *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon: A New Text Edition and Translation with Introduction and Special Treatment of Columns 13–17* (STDJ 79; Leiden: Brill, 2009). This article also uses the translation in *DSSSE*. The best commentary on this text is the third edition of J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1* (*1Q20*) (3d ed.; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 2004).

[43] I only know of two studies specifically on these columns of the *Genesis Apocryphon*, namely E. Eshel, "The 'imago mundi' of the 'Genesis Apocryphon,' in *Heavenly Tablets: Interpretation, Identity and Tradition in Ancient Judaism* (ed. L. LiDonnici and A. Lieber; JSJSup 119; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 111–31 and D. Machiela, ""Each to his own inheritance": Geography as an Evaluative Tool in the Genesis Apocryphon," *DSD* 15 (2008): 50–66.

[44] הוא די יפלג כול ארעא.

[45] Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon*, 140.

[46] תשלט עליהון ארעא וכול די עליהא בימיא ובטוריא.

[47] אדין אנה נוח נפקת והלכת בארעא לאורכהא ולפותיהא.

[48] Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon*, 155.

[49] "God appeared to me in a night vision and said to me: Go up to Ramat Hazor, which is to the north of Bethel, the place where you dwell; lift up your eyes and look to the east, the west, the south and the north. Look at all this land that I give you and your descendants for ever. The following morning, he went up to Ramat Hazor and looked at the land from that height, from the River of Egypt as far as the Lebanon and Senir, and from the Great Sea up to Hauran, and all the land of Gebal as far as Qadesh, and all the Great Desert which is to the east of Hauran and Senir as far as the Euphrates." (1QapGen 21:8–12)

> The isthmus between them, the start of the river[50] as far as the river Tina [. . .] all the land of the north, all of it, until it reaches [. . .] and this area passes the waters of the Great Sea until it reaches Gadir [. . .] he allocated it by lot to Japheth and his sons so that they would inherit it as an eternal inheritance. (1QapGen 16:9–12)

Nor has Shem's lot been preserved much better:

> And the second lot fell to Shem, so that he and his sons could inherit it [. . .] the waters of the river Tina [. . .] as far as the river Tina [. . .] as far as the Great Sea of Salt and this frontier runs like a spring from [. . .] which turns towards the west and passes [. . .] until it reaches [. . .] to the east. (1QapGen 16:14–20)

Almost nothing has reached us about Ham's lot. However, column 17 has preserved somewhat better the distribution of the lands between the sons of Shem and Japheth, which allows us to understand and pinpoint the territories allocated to each of the sons of Noah. The distribution of Japheth (17:16–19) is short and, apart from the case of Gomer, of whom it says that his is in the north until it reaches the river Tina, and of Yavan, to whom the islands close to Lud are allotted, contains no other geographical information. The distribution among the sons of Shem, framed by two *lacunae*, is more detailed and interesting:

> And Shem divided his portion among his sons. The first portion fell to Elam, in the north, alongside the waters of the river Tigris until it reaches the Red Sea at its source which is in the north, and turns towards the west, towards Asur, until it reaches the Tigris [. . .] After him, to Aram (fell) the land between the two rivers until it reaches the start of [. . .] Arara. To Lud fell the mountain of Taurus, and the portion passes and extends towards the west until it reaches Magog and [. . .] the sea from the east to the north, which is in the heart of this branch that is at the start of the three parts of the eastern sea. To Arpachshad [. . .] which goes to the south, all the land that the Euphrates waters, and all [. . .] all the valleys and plains there are between them, and the islands there are in the midst of the gulf [. . .] and Amana until it reaches the Euphrates [. . . This is] the portion that Noah his father divided and gave to him. (1QapGen 17:7–15)

---

[50] In *DSSSE* 1.37, we translated the Aramaic expression ראיש בעין as "riverhead." Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon*, 95 proposes "the head at a spring (?)." E. Eshel, "Isaiah 11:15: A New Interpretation Based on *Genesis Apocryphon*," *DSD* 13 (2006): 38–45 at 43 proposes to understand the expression as "the sources of the Euphrates river," considering בעין to be name for the Euphrates, which seems unlikely to me, since in 1QapGen 17:12 the Euphrates has the usual name פורת.

In spite of the *lacunae* in the preserved text, it is possible to appreciate certain differences from the description in *Jubilees*.[51] But it is clear that the territories assigned to each of the sons of Noah are the same in both documents, and that both differ from the biblical text in allotting the promised land to the descendants of Shem and not to Ham's, and both depend on the Ionian map of the world. So there is no doubt that *Jubilees* and the *Genesis Apocryphon* are related in some way, although scholars do not agree on which of the two compositions is older and which depends on which.[52] Here we can ignore this question, since the central point—the modification of the biblical text to assign the right to the land of Israel to the descendants of Shem from the distribution of the land after the flood—is common to both texts. The *Genesis Apocryphon* stresses this point even more than *Jubilees* to make the description of Arpachshad's lot match the territory that Abraham covers in 21:8–12. By combining the promise of land made to Abraham with its distribution previously made by Noah, the *Genesis Apocryphon* leaves absolutely no doubt about who the lawful owner of the land is, in spite of the presence of Canaanites in the land and its biblical label "the land of Canaan." Even before God made the promise to deliver the land to Abraham and his descendants (in Gen 15), Abraham was already the lawful and exclusive heir of the land that the Canaanites occupied unlawfully, since Noah had allocated it to Arpachshad and his descendants forever. The geographical data of the

[51] Not only in the sequence in which the portions of the sons of Noah are described, but also in the sequence in which the descendants of Shem are listed, where the positions of Aram and Arpachshad are inverted, giving the latter the westernmost part of Shem's lot, i.e., the promised land. In "Each to his own inheritance," 58–59, Machiela explains these differences since the *Genesis Apocryphon* is consistent in listing the divisions following a north-south axis for the sons of Noah and goes from east to west for the grandchildren, whereas in this case *Jubilees* follows the order of the biblical text.

[52] Fitzmyer (*The Genesis Apocryphon*, 16–25) is one of those scholars who considers *Jubilees* to be earlier and the *Genesis Apocryphon* to depend on it of. Eshel, "The 'imago mundi'," 111, states that the *Genesis Apocryphon* is earlier ("Of these texts, the *Genesis Apocryphon* [1QapGen] is, in my opinion, the oldest surviving Second Temple period text mapping the inhabited world"), as does M. Segal, "The Literary Relationship between the Genesis Apocryphon and Jubilees: The Chronology of Abram and Sarai's Descent to Egypt," *ArSt* 8 (2010): 71–88. I claim that both writings depend on a common source, the lost *Book of Noah*; see my *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies in the Aramaic Texts from Qumran* (STDJ 9; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 40–41, an opinion that Machiela shares in his new edition. See the detailed discussion of the problem in J. Kugel, "Which is Older, *Jubilees* or the *Genesis Apocryphon?* An Exegetical Approach," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International Conference held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem* (*July 6–8, 2008*) (ed. A. D. Roitman, L. H. Schiffman, and S. Tzoref; STDJ 93; Leiden: Brill, 2011), 257–94, who is in favour of *Jubilees* being earlier.

interpretation of Gen 10 in the *Book of Jubilees* and in the *Genesis Apocryphon* have been transformed into a theological statement. This subtly combines the promise of the land in Gen 15, through Abraham's genealogy in Gen 11, with the distribution of the land after the flood, so assuring Israel's right to possess forever the land that in Genesis 10 had been allocated to Canaan and his descendants.

B. DIVINE ENCOUNTERS

CHAPTER FOUR

THE HEAVENLY TABLETS IN THE *BOOK OF JUBILEES*

In the *Book of Jubilees* there are few terms whose sense is as rich and varied as that of the "heavenly tablets." It is very strange that this term has not been the subject of a study since the old one of Eppel.[1] In this note we intend to briefly present the passages from *Jubilees* that mention the "heavenly tablets," offering a "taxonomy" of these references according to their sense, hoping to show the richness and complexity underlying the term.[2]

On the basis of the realities reflected in each one of these passages, we are able to group them into five categories we will discuss separately.

---

[1] R. Eppel, "Les tables de la Loi et les tables célestes," *RHPR* 17 (1937): 401–12. The references to the "heavenly tablets" in the literature of the apocrypha are conveniently reviewed in R. H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch or* 1 *Enoch*: Translated from the Editor's Ethiopic Text (Oxford: Clarendon, 1912), 91–92; W. Bousset and H. Gressmann, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter* (HNT 21; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1926), 258ff.; P. Volz, *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1934), 290–92, 303–4. The theme has also been discussed, though from a limited and erroneous perspective, by G. Widengren, *The Ascension of the Apostle and the Heavenly Book* (UUÅ 7; Uppsala: Lundequist, 1950), and quite correctly by H. Bietenhard, *Die himmlische Welt im Urchristentum und Spätjudentum* (WUNT 2; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1951), 231–54. It has been studied from the perspective of Qumran by F. Nötscher, "Himmlische Bücher und Schicksalsglaube in Qumran," *RevQ* 1/3 (1959): 405–11; in conjunction with the Enoch literature by E. Rau, *Kosmologie, Eschatologie und Lehrautorität Henochs* (Diss. Hamburg, 1974), 345–98; in relation to the Sumerian/Assyrian "Book of Life" by S. M. Paul, "Heavenly Tablets and the Book of Life," *JANES* 5 (1973): 345–52; and in summary form by C. Münchow, *Ethik und Eschatologie: Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der frühjüdischen Apokalyptik mit einem Ausblick auf das Neue Testament* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981), 44–49.

[2] Along with the recent edition by J. C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (2 vols.; CSCO 510–11, Scriptores Aethiopici 87–88; Leuven: Peeters, 1989), and the Ethiopic text edited by R. H. Charles, Maṣḥafa kufālē *or the Ethiopic Version of the Hebrew Book of Jubilees* (Anecdota Oxoniensia; Oxford: Clarendon, 1895), we have also used the translations of K. Berger, *Das Buch der Jubiläen* (JSHRZ 2.3; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1981), L. Fusella, "Libro dei Giubilei," *Apocrifi dell'Antico Testamento* (ed. P. Sacchi; Torino: UET, 1981), 179–411, and F. Corrienta and A. Piñero, "Jubileos," in *Apócrifos del Antiguo Testamento* 2 (ed. A. Díez Macho; Madrid: Cristiandad, 1983), 67–188. Citations from *Jubilees* follow the translation of the Ethiopic text in VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* vol. 2.

1. Heavenly Tablets: The Tablets of the Law

The first category, which is seemingly easy to recognize,[3] is the identification of the "heavenly tablets" with the "tablets of the law," that is, with the Torah of Moses, or, to be very precise, the divine, pre-existing archetype of the Torah. The juxtaposition of the terms is readily understood: The tablets of the Law in Exod 32:15; 34:1, 28–29; Deut 4:13; 5:22, etc. are now understood within a later tradition as those which Moses received directly from God—the whole of the Torah "scroll by scroll" (*b. Giṭ.* 60a). In the same way, the tablets of the Ten Commandments deposited in the ark in Deut 10:1–5 indicate for the *Damascus Document* 5:2 that all of the Torah was preserved there. That both expressions can be taken as synonymous seems to me beyond all doubt. One convincing bit of evidence is a variant in the *Testament of Asher.* In mss *c, h, i,* and *j* we read ἐν ταῖς πλαξὶ τῶν οὐρανῶν in place of ἐν ταῖς πλαξὶ τῶν ἐντολῶν.[4] The same equivalence seems to be suggested in *Jubilees* both in the Prologue and in *Jub.* 1:1 where there is mention of the "tablets of the law and the commandments" when the purpose of the book is being described. Though the idea of a preexistent Torah is common in rabbinic thought, there are relatively few references to "heavenly tablets" in *Jubilees* that we may include in this category.

Jub. *3:9–11*

> After forty days had come to an end for Adam in the land where he had been created, we brought him into the garden of Eden to work and keep it. His wife was brought (there) on the eightieth day. After this she entered the garden of Eden. For this reason a commandment was written in the heavenly tablets for the one who gives birth to a child: if she gives birth to a male, she is to remain in impurity for seven days like the first seven days; then for thirty-three days she is to remain in the blood of purification. She is not to touch any sacred thing nor to enter the sanctuary until she completes these days for a male. As for a female she is to remain in her impurity two weeks of days like the first two weeks and sixty-six days in the blood of purification. Their total is eighty days.

The citation of Lev 12:2–5 is particularly literal. It is curious that a biblical prescription has been placed in relationship with the entry of Adam into

---

[3] This aspect has been especially noted by Eppel, "Les tables," and by C. Albeck, *Das Buch der Jubiläen und die Halacha* (Siebenundvierzigster Bericht der Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums in Berlin; Berlin: Scholem, 1930), 4.

[4] Cf. M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text* (PVTG 1.2; Leiden: Brill, 1978), 138.

paradise. The basis for their association is, obviously, a numerical coincidence involving the forty and eighty days. This does not arise from the biblical text but from haggadic material characteristic of *Jubilees* and also represented in Philo, *QG* 2.2. That the "heavenly tablets" here are none other than the Torah is not only clearly indicated by the citation, but also by the continuation of the text which repeats the haggadic basis for the eighty days, according to a new text, Lev 12:4, and ends with: "These are the law and testimony that were written for Israel to keep for all times" (*Jub.* 3:14).

Jub. *33:10–12*

After an haggadic treatment of the sin of Reuben with Bilhah (Gen 35:22), which has various points in common with the *Test. Reub.* 3, the author concludes:

> For this reason it is written and ordained on the heavenly tablets that a man is not to lie with his father's wife and that he is not to uncover the covering of his father because it is impure. They are certainly to die together—the man who lies with his father's wife and the woman, too—because they have done something impure on the earth. There is to be nothing impure before our God within the nation he has chosen as a possession. All of the Lord's holy ones said: "So be it, so be it."

In spite of the fact that the author conflates the first citation, Lev 20:1, with Deut 23:1, and substitutes the holy ones of the Lord for the people who respond in the second citation from Deut 27:20—in order to accentuate the pre-Mosaic character of the prescription—it is in *Jub.* 33:13 where Moses is being ordered to declare the commandment and, above all, in *Jub.* 33:19 where he is ordered "[to] tell them these words of the testament," that we clearly recognize that in this case the "heavenly tablets" are none other than the celestial archetype of the Mosaic law. That the *Jubilees* passage deals with an exegetical modification of the biblical text is seen in the haggadic modification of the story[5] and the apologetic justification of Reuben: "for the statute, the punishment, and the law had not been completely revealed" (cf. *Jub.* 33:15–17).[6]

---

[5] Cf. L. Finkelstein, "The Book of Jubilees and the Rabbinic Halaka," *HTR* 16 (1923): 39–61, esp. 55–56.

[6] The same interpretation with respect to David in CD 5:2–5 and with respect to Boaz in *Cant. Rab.* 8:1. See the general formulation in Rom 4:15.

Jub. *16:3–4*

> We told her the name of her son as it is ordained on the heavenly tablets—Isaac—and (that) when we returned to her at a specific time she would have become pregnant with a son.

The passage contains, together with a clear reference to Gen 18:14, a possible allusion to Gen 17:19 where it is God himself who designates Isaac's name. This same text is used in the rabbinic tradition to affirm the divine origin of the name of the patriarch.[7] The inscription of the name of Isaac upon the "heavenly tablets" indicates to us that in this case they correspond to the Torah.

Jub. *4:5*

After a summary of the story of Cain and Abel, the passage goes on:

> For this reason it has been written on the heavenly tablets: "Cursed is the person who beats his companion maliciously." All who saw (it) said: "let him be (cursed). And let the man who has seen but has not told be cursed like him."

The passage evidently deals with a citation of Deut 27:24 with the already noted substitution of the ratification of the people. But the passage continues with an expansion that does not have a specific biblical parallel, but it seems that it is based upon Lev 5:1 and that this passage has been included in the same citation, "And let the man who has seen but has not told be cursed like him." The fact that *Jubilees* bases its notion of the accusatory function of the angels (which has an excellent parallel in CD 9:16–22) upon this citation (v. 6), would suggest that this passage should not be included within this category. But the possibility that we are dealing here with a fusion of two biblical texts and the fact that the traditional halakah likewise sees in Lev 5:1 the biblical basis of the obligation to present testimony permits us to include it in this way.

2. Heavenly Tablets: Heavenly Register of Good and Evil

The heavenly accounting of human actions begins, like so many other things, at Sumer.[8] The idea spread rapidly to the rest of the surround-

---

[7] Cf. *Mek. Pisḥa* 16 (ed. Horovitz-Rabin, 56, lines 18–19).

[8] Cf. Widengren, *Ascension of the Apostle*, 7–21; F. Nötscher, "Schicksalsglaube in Qumran und Umwelt," *BZ* 3 (1959): 205–34, esp. 205–17, Paul, "Heavenly Tablets," 345–46, and

ing cultures,[9] and we encounter it in the Old Testament[10] and, somewhat later, in the New Testament.[11] The idea had a long life and its elaboration appears in rabbinic literature.[12] In *Jubilees* the notion appears in two references to the "heavenly tablets."

Jub. *19:9*

> He [Abraham] said nothing about the promise of the land which said that the Lord would give it to him and his descendants after him. He pleaded for a place there to bury his dead because he was found faithful and was recorded on the heavenly tablets as a friend of the Lord.

The designation "friend of God/the Lord" here given to Abraham goes back to the biblical text: Gen 41:5, Dan(LXX) 3:35, 2 Chr 20:7 and, finally, the Palestinian Targumim (*Neofiti I* and the *Fragmentary Targum*). It is also implied in Gen 18:17. Genesis 18:17 is the text which is the basis of all the later development of the designation "friend of God" in rabbinic Judaism.[13] Given this, its mention here might be nothing more than a case of exegetical development. But a strict parallel with *Jub.* 30:19–22 leads us to view the inscription as a consequence of "he was found faithful" and to consider Abraham's inscription in the "heavenly tablets" as a registering of that fidelity.

Jub. *30:19–22*

After the recounting of the kidnapping of Dinah and the vengeance of her brothers Simeon and Levi, and the use of the episode for an interesting halakic discussion which ends with the unconditional justification of the action of her brothers, *Jubilees* gives a panegyric concerning their actions which justify their inscription in the "heavenly tablets."

> So blessing and justice before the God of all are entered for him as a testimony on the heavenly tablets. We ourselves remember the justice which the man performed during his lifetime at all times of the year. As far as a

W. W. Hallo, "Postscript" (to S. M. Paul, "Heavenly Tablets and the Book of Life"), *JANES* 5 (1973): 352–53.

[9] An excellent example of a sarcastic reflex of this notion is encountered in one of the fragments of Euripides: "Perchance he believes that sins are written in a book before Zeus, that Zeus reads it and judges men according to them. The heavens themselves are not big enough for man's sins to be written upon them!" (*Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* frg. 506).

[10] E.g. Exod 32:32–33; Mal 3:16; Dan 10:21; 12:1.

[11] E.g. Luke 10:20; Rev 3:5; 13:8.

[12] E.g. *b. Roš Haš.* 16b.

[13] E.g. *b. Menaḥ.* 53b, *Sifre Num.* 15:41; *Mek. Bo* 18:22; *Pirqe R. El.* 25.

> thousand generations will they enter (it). It will come to him and his family after him. He has been recorded on the heavenly tablets as a friend and a just man. I have written this entire message for you and have ordered you to tell the Israelites not to sin or transgress the statutes or violate the covenant which was established for them so that they should perform it and be recorded as friends. But if they transgress and behave in any impure ways, they will be recorded on the heavenly tablets as enemies. They will be erased from the book of the living and will be recorded in the book of those who will be uprooted from the earth.

The reasons for inscription are, in the first case, the brothers' works, that is, their actions at Shechem; in the second, the performance of justice—and this attribute is reflected in the inscription simultaneously with friendship with God. It is very interesting that in this case the inscription in the "heavenly tablets" is made out of consideration for its motivational value. It ought to move its hearers to imitate Levi in the carrying out of the law and the covenant in order to also attain inscription as friends. The passage underlines, on the other hand, that inscription in the heavenly register will be made in any case. One might be inscribed in them as an enemy; that is, there exists a double register. From here the author passes imperceptibly on to mentioning the Book of Life. Whoever is inscribed in the "heavenly tablets" as an enemy is blotted out of the Book of Life. This determines one's future destiny insofar as one is inscribed in the Book of Destruction—the consequences of which are precisely spelled out in *Jub.* 36:30.

3. The Book of Destiny

It is only a small step from the registration of actions as a mere record to the registration of similar actions of a predestinational character. *Jubilees* 30:9–22 indicates to us how it is possible to pass from the one idea to the other. A series of passages, more numerous than those referring to the idea of the simple registration of accomplished acts, clearly give evidence that in *Jubilees* the "heavenly tablets" are also equivalent to the Book of Destiny in that, not only past acts, but also future castigation and future rewards are engraved and fixed forever. This is the principal aspect of the "heavenly tablets" in the rest of the literature of the Apocrypha, most especially in *1 Enoch.*

Jub. *5:13–14*

After relating the destruction of the fallen angels and that of their descendants, the giants, in a manner similar to that in *1 En.* 10, and announcing

a new creation in which all have the opportunity to be just, the account continues:

> The judgment of them all has been ordained and written on the heavenly tablets; there is no injustice. (As for) all who transgress from the way in which it was ordained for them to go—if they do not go in it, judgment has been written down for each creature and for each kind. There is nothing which is in heaven or on the earth, in the light, the darkness, Sheol, the deep, or in the dark place—all their judgments have been ordained, written and inscribed.

The Ethiopic text does not lack ambiguities. The castigation determined in the "heavenly tablets" is just, in so far as it corresponds to transgressions committed now or in the future. But it is not clear whether the context within which this notion moves is that of the Old Testament notion of predestination or that of pure determinism in so far as that the conduct one is to follow has been likewise determined in each case. This same ambiguity is repeated in other texts in this category.

Jub. *16:9*

> It has now been commanded and engraved on the heavenly tablets regarding all his descendants that he is to remove them, uproot them, execute judgment on them like the judgment of Sodom, and not to leave him any human descendants on the earth on the day of judgment.

It is interesting that in this passage it is not the sin of Lot and his daughters which is here engraved against them in the "heavenly tablets." Lot and his daughters have been saved from the punishment of Sodom, and their subsequent sin does not annul this salvation. What is inscribed in the "heavenly tablets" is the destiny of his descendants as a consequence of his sin. Lot will not have descendants in the land on the day of judgment. His progeny is destined to destruction just as Sodom, independently of their acts.

Jub. *24:33*

This passage contains the announcement of the final destruction of the Philistines. After having faithfully followed the story-line of Gen 26, which ends with an oath of covenant between Isaac and Abimelek, the author of *Jubilees* completely transforms its significance. The well which Isaac secured by the oath does not give water and by this Isaac knows that his oath had been made under pressure. He then pronounces a terrible curse against the Philistines. The curse is effective because it already existed in

the "heavenly tablets": the destruction of the Philistine progeny is predestined and will be accomplished on the Day of Judgment.

> This is the way it has been written and inscribed regarding him on the heavenly tablets—to do (this) to him on the day of judgment so that he may be eradicated from the earth.

Not only punishments are written in the Book of Destiny, but likewise rewards. One finds the entire future there, as the following passages demonstrate.

Jub. *23:32*

> Now you, Moses, write down these words because this is how it is written and entered in the testimony of the heavenly tablets for this history of eternity.

The formulation of this passage is unique and its interpretation is not easy. The mention of Moses and the order that he write down what he has been told seems to place it in relationship to our passages in *Jub.* 1:1, 5, 7, 27, 29. But there is no mention of the "heavenly tablets" in these latter passages and I think that the best way to understand the formulation is to see it as a postscript which encompasses all the revelations which preceded. In reality, it affirms that it is "these words," the revelation that follows the death of Abraham (*Jub.* 23:11–31), that are found contained in the "heavenly tablets." This revelation contains a simple, but comprehensive, vision of history. The passage is clearly divided into two parts: *Jub.* 23:11–25 and 26–31, in which the first represents the progressive degradation of humanity and the second its equally progressive restoration which begins with the messianic era. Therefore, the whole of human destiny is written down on the "heavenly tablets."

Jub. *31:32b*

> This is the way it is ordained regarding the two of them, and it is entered for them as an eternal testimony on the heavenly tablets just as Isaac blessed them.

At first glance, the parallel with the expression used in *Jub.* 30:19 should caution us not to see here more than a celestial record of the blessings of Levi and Judah. Yet an examination of the immediately proceeding context makes it clear that the blessings are not related to the actions of Levi and Judah, but that the blessings predestine their future and the future of their descendants. The sentence is preceded by the exclamation of Jacob

remembering these blessings: "Now I know that I and my sons, too, have an eternal hope before the God of all!" (*Jub.* 31:32a). And, in effect, what both of these blessings contain is nothing less than the eternal priesthood through the line of Levi and the throne and arrival of the Messiah through the line of Judah, as had already been suggested by Syncellus in his *Chronographia*.[14] The author of *Jubilees* places the blessing in the context of a visit of Jacob to Isaac which has no biblical basis, but an echo of which appears in the *Test. Levi* 9. Isaac pronounces the blessings under the influence of divine inspiration: "A spirit of prophecy descended into his mouth. He took Levi by his right hand and Judah by his left hand" (*Jub.* 31:12). But the final confirmation that the blessings will become reality and the foundation of the hope of Jacob is that it is established for them in the "heavenly tablets" which holds the destinies of both tribes.

Jub. *32:21–22*

> In a night vision he saw an angel coming down from heaven with seven tablets in his hands. He gave (them) to Jacob, and he read them. He read everything in them what would happen to him and his sons throughout all ages. After he had shown him everything that was written on the tablets . . .

The predestinarian content of these tablets and its identification with that of the Book of Destiny is obvious and requires no comment. The only point which requires explanation is that the Ethiopic version speaks here only of the "tablets" and not the "heavenly tablets." The Latin version uses the phrases *septem tabulae buxeae* and *tabulis buxeis*.[15] That the text presupposes the same tablets as the "heavenly tablets" appears probable to me on the basis of Origen's citation of the *Prayer of Joseph*, preserved in his *Philocalia* 23.5: "As a divine book, that is to say, the heavens contain all the future. Jacob's utterance in the *Prayer of Jacob* should be understood in the light of this: 'For I have read in the Heavenly Tablets all that will happen to you and all your children.'"[16] The parallel is exact enough to sustain the identification here of the "tablets" and the "heavenly tablets."

---

[14] εὐλόγησε τὸν Λευὶ ὡς ἀρχιερέα καὶ τὸν Ἰούδα ὡς βασιλέα καὶ ἄρχοντα (ed. Dindorf, 97).

[15] Cf. H. Rönsch, *Das Buch der Jubiläen oder die Kleine Genesis* (Leipzig: Fues, 1874; repr. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1970), 62.

[16] The same text is found in Eusebius, *Praep. Ev.* 7.64 and in the Latin translation of Procopius of Gaza, *Comm. in Gen.* 29. On *The Prayer of Joseph*, cf. the magisterial study of J. Z. Smith, "The Prayer of Joseph," in *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of E. R. Goodenough* (ed. J. Neusner; Leiden: Brill, 1968), 253–94, republished in J. Z. Smith, *Map is not Territory* (SJLA 23; Leiden: Brill, 1978), 24–66.

4. Heavenly Tablets: The Calendar and Feasts

Of a completely different character than the previous categories of the "heavenly tablets" are the last two categories presented below. In the *Book of Jubilees* a majority of the mentions of the "heavenly tablets" fit within these categories. The instructions contained in these tablets do not coincide with the biblical text; neither do they have a predestinarian character. That which is transmitted in them is the exact knowledge of the calendar and feasts. In a way, they are a series of prescriptions which regulate the "correct" application of the biblical text to the changing situations of life.

Jub. *6:30–35*

> All the days of the commandments will be fifty-two weeks of days: (they will make) the entire year complete. So it has been engraved and ordained on the heavenly tablets. One is not allowed to transgress a single year, year by year. Now you command the Israelites to keep the years in this number—364 days. Then the year will be complete and it will not disturb its time from its days or from its festivals because everything will happen in harmony with their testimony. They will neither omit a day nor disturb a festival. If they transgress and do not celebrate them in accord with his command, then all of them will disturb their times. The years will be moved from this; they will disturb the times and the years will be moved. They will transgress their prescribed pattern. All the Israelites will forget and will not find the way of the years. They will forget the first of the month, the season, and the sabbath; they will err with respect to the entire prescribed pattern of the years. For I know and from now on will inform you—not from my own mind because this is the way the book is written in front of me, and the divisions of times are ordained on the heavenly tablets, lest they forget the covenantal festivals and walk in the festivals of the nations, after their error and after their ignorance.

What is important in these two mentions of the "heavenly tablets" is that, according to them, the calendar, as such, in the distribution of days, has been established in the "heavenly tablets." This particular calendar, the same as in *1 Enoch* and which was in force in the Qumran community, is a solar calendar of three hundred and sixty-four days (v. 32), fifty-two weeks, of four equal seasons which always begin upon the same day of the week—Wednesday.[17] Already at the beginning of his work, the author

[17] The literature concerning this calendar is very extensive. The most relevant has been collected in a long bibliographical note in F. García Martínez, "Calendarios en Qumrán," *EstBíb* 54 (1996): 327–59, 523–52, at 529–30.

has introduced this notion by means of an exegetical modification of the biblical text: "The Lord appointed *the sun* [and not the sun *and the moon*] as a great sign above the earth for days, sabbaths, months, festivals, years, sabbaths of years, jubilees, and all times of the years" (*Jub.* 2:9) and consequently has used it throughout the whole of the work, fixing by it the correct celebration of the festivals. However, even though we are dealing with a calendar that traces its origins back to the exile and is based upon an ancient priestly tradition, the important point here is that the author resorts to the "heavenly tablets" as the definitive means by which he legitimizes this calendar. He will also do the same in concrete applications of the calendar in order to determine the feasts.

Jub. *6:17*

> For this reason it has been ordained and written on the heavenly tablets that they should celebrate the festival of weeks during this month—once a year—to renew the covenant each and every year.

For our author, who places the Feast of Weeks in relation to the Noachic and Mosaic covenants, the feast is celebrated in the third month. The only thing determined about the feast in the "heavenly tablets" is its celebration in the third month. Much later (*Jub.* 15:1; 16:13; 44:4) he fixes the day of celebration exactly as Sunday the fifteenth. This inscription upon the "heavenly tablets" allows him to maintain a position different from that of the Sadducees, for whom the feast ought to fall always on a Sunday, but not necessarily in the third month, and from that of the Pharisees for whom it ought to be celebrated fifty days after the Passover, that is, in the third month but neither on a Sunday nor necessarily on the fifteenth day. These disputes of the schools demonstrate the need for interpreting Lev 23:15. Our author knows the biblical text and makes a direct allusion to it—precisely: "For I [God] have written (this) in the book of the first law [that is, the Pentateuch] in which I wrote for you that you should celebrate it at each of its times one day in a year" (*Jub.* 6:22). This is the date which he determines and fixes by inscription upon the "heavenly tablets."

Jub. *6:28–29a*

> For this reason he ordained them for himself forever as memorial festivals. So they are ordained, and they enter them on the heavenly tablets.

This passage deals with the first day of each three month period, or, as is said in *Jub.* 6:23, "the first of the first month, the first of the fourth month,

the first of the seventh month, and the first of the tenth month," which are instituted as a "memorial festivals" (*Jub.* 6:29). In the biblical text, as in the rabbinic tradition, in which one encounters not one trace of these feasts (*pace* Charles), only the first day of the seventh month is a festival day (Lev 23:23), the New Year, and only upon it is prescribed a sacrifice distinct from each New Moon sacrifice (cf. Num 29:2 and 28:11, also Ezek 46:6). To judge by *Jub.* 7:3ff., for our author it is precisely the sacrifice of the New Year that ought to be made during these four feasts. In *Jub.* 6:24–28, the author determines each of these four days according to the important events marking each one of them during the year Noah spent in the ark (Gen 8:21–9:17).[18] Yet, the conclusive legitimation of the introduction of these feasts is none other than their inscription upon the "heavenly tablets."

Jub. *16:28–29*

> We blessed him eternally and all the descendants who would follow him thought all the history of the earth because he had celebrated this festival at its time in accord with the testimony of the heavenly tablets. For this reason it has been ordained on the heavenly tablets regarding Israel that they should celebrate the festival joyfully for seven days during the seventh month in the Lord's presence—a law which is eternal throughout their history in each and every year.

In the same way that Noah celebrated the Feast of Weeks, so Abraham also celebrated the Feast of Tabernacles. The day of celebration is not precisely fixed here, but in *Jub.* 32:4 it is specifically stated that it is the fifteenth, as it is in the biblical text (Lev 23:34). Given that the second mention of the "heavenly tablets" introduces a rather literal citation of Lev 23:41, it is therefore possible to think that here the "heavenly tablets" are none other than the Torah, and that Abraham is blessed simply because he celebrated the feast "according to its time," before it would be established in Israel. But it is evident from the emphasis upon the calendar and upon the exact time of the celebration of each feast that, in reality, the text tells us that Abraham celebrated the feast at the appropriate moment, at the correct time, and that the seventh month is the seventh month of the calendar revealed in the "heavenly tablets" (cf. *Jub.* 1:10; 6:33, 35, 37, 38, etc.).

---

[18] R. H. Charles, *The Book of Jubilees or the Little Genesis. Translated from the Editor's Ethiopic Text* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1902), 54, conveniently collects in a note all the other events which the author associates with the beginning of each one of the four seasons.

Jub. *18:19*

> This is the way it is ordained and written on the heavenly tablets regarding Israel and his descendants: (they are) to celebrate this festival for seven days with festal happiness.

The chronological indications of *Jub.* 17:15 (the twelfth day of the first month) and 18:3 (arriving at the place in three days) imply that the sacrifice of Isaac took place on the fifteenth of Nisan, the day of Passover. The feast, therefore, to which our text alludes appears to be the Feast of Unleavened Bread. The duration of seven days is midrashically deduced from the journey of Abraham (*Jub.* 18:18–19). Yet, in *Jub.* 49:22 it is designated by its name and is related to the biblical text in terms of its duration, so that the feast could be given a basis for being considered separately. But the reference to the duration militates against this hypothesis. In either case, its inscription upon the "heavenly tablets" indicates to us that it ought to be celebrated in accordance with the calendar established there.

Jub. *32:27–29*

> He [Jacob] celebrated one more day there. On it he sacrificed exactly as he had been sacrificing on previous days. He named it Addition because that day was added. He named the previous ones Festival. This is the way it was revealed that it should be, and it was written on the heavenly tablets. For this reason it was revealed to him that he should celebrate it and add it to the seven days of the festival. It was called Addition because of the fact that it is entered in the testimony of the festal days in accord with the number of days in the year.

The Ethiopic text, and above all v. 29, is difficult to interpret. Charles corrected this verse presupposing a whole string of translation errors from the original Hebrew in order to understand v. 29 in terms of v. 27. Charles translated v. 29: "... because that it was recorded *amongst the days of the feast days* according to the number of the days of the year." If this correction is accepted, and it appears to be confirmed by the Latin translation, the author has laid the basis in the "heavenly tablets" for the introduction of an additional feast day to the seven festival days of Tabernacles. Sacchi[19] even thinks that the only way in which to interpret the Latin text is that it deals with an additional day which implies that the Essene calendar was

[19] In a note to the translation of Fusella, in *Apocrifi dell'Antico Testamento*, 358.

effectively a three hundred and sixty-five day calendar. This additional day would not be considered in the computation in order to maintain the three hundred and sixty-four day year and yet permit the year to always begin on Wednesday. But this explanation, as all that suppose an annual intercalary day, sharply clashes with the notion that the year consists only of three hundred and sixty-four days. In my opinion, what the author has created here is a subtle exegesis of the biblical text. The Feast of Tabernacles is a feast of seven days according to the biblical formulation found in Lev 23:34–42 and Deut 16:13–15. But the mention of the eighth day in Lev 23:36–39 and, above all, in Num 29:35, makes clear that the seven days ought not to be taken as a week. Now, the author of *Jubilees* maintains the expression of "seven days" for the feast in *Jub.* 16:28–29 and in 32:6, which obliges him to find a basis for a sacrifice on the eighth day. As for the rest of the feasts, the "heavenly tablets" give the justification for this additional day. A confirmation of this type of interpretation is given in Josephus, *Ant.* 3.252, which utilizes the name ἀσαρθά for the feast of Pentecost, while an "additional" day to the seven weeks is called by the Aramaic term which corresponds to the Hebrew term used in 2 Chr 7:9 for the additional feast.

Jub. *49:8*

> For it is an eternal statute and it is engraved on the heavenly tablets regarding the Israelites that they are to celebrate it each and every year on its day, once a year, throughout their entire history. There is no temporal limit because it is ordained forever.

Therefore, the celebration of the Passover in *Jubilees* presents notable differences with respect to rabbinic halakah as to what hour, in what situation, what participants, etc. should be required for the celebration. The sole instruction inscribed in the "heavenly tablets" is the essential act: the celebrating *in die eius* (as it is expressed in the Latin tradition) and according to the calendar revealed in the "heavenly tablets."

5. Heavenly Tablets: New Halakot

Jub. *3:31*

> For this reason it has been commanded in the tablets regarding all those who know the judgment of the law that they cover their shame and not uncover themselves as the nations uncover themselves.

The reference to the "nations"[20] indicates the era in which the halakah originated and the concrete circumstances which it addresses, that is, it is situated within an Hellenistic context. The precept, as such, has no biblical basis,[21] but it is presented as an interpretation of Gen 3:21. The text is cited in *Jub.* 3:26 and in 3:30 and pertains only to Adam in distinction from the animals; it is explained that God permits only Adam to cover his genitals (i.e., his "shame"). But the definitive basis for the prescription is to be found ordered in the "heavenly tablets." For the author of *Jubilees*, this halakah is so important that it is included among the Noachic laws (*Jub.* 7:20). In the rabbinic tradition, on the contrary, it is not even considered a law. However, to go naked is seen as an offense against the Creator (cf. *b. Yebam.* 63b).

Jub. *4:32*

> For this reason it has been ordained on the heavenly tablets: "By the instrument with which a man kills his fellow he is to be killed. As he wounded him so are they to do to him."

This halakah has no parallel in the rabbinic tradition. Moreover, it goes against the tendency to spiritualize the law of retribution itself or to substitute for it a type of monetary compensation. Here we have the point of departure for an haggadic discussion, according to which Cain could have been executed by being crushed by the stones of his house which would have been destroyed with him in it, "for with a stone he had killed Abel and, by a just punishment, he was killed with a stone" (*Jub.* 4:31). The halakah in itself is no more than an amplification of Lev 24:19–20, but this amplification is backed up by its inscription upon the "heavenly tablets."

Jub. *15:25*

> The law is (valid) for all history forever. There is no circumcising of days, or omitting any day of the eight days because it is an ordinance ordained and written on the heavenly tablets.

---

[20] As Charles notes in *The Book of Jubilees*, 29.

[21] Albeck, *Das Buch der Jubiläen und die Halacha*, 33: "Die gewundene Ausdrucksweise 'alle, die das Urteil des Gesetzes kennen' beweist, daß sich der Verfasser darüber im klaren war, daß ein solches Gesetz aus der Thora nicht abzuleiten ist."

The halakah, in itself, could be nothing more than an emphatic affirmation of the biblical text (cf. Gen 17:12 and also Finkelstein's interpretation[22] of our text). Although the emphasis placed upon and the resort to the "heavenly tablets" appears to indicate an uncertainty as to its precise dating, its clear polemical position fits well within the circumstances of the Hellenistic era. In rabbinic Judaism (*m. Šabb.* 19:5) a tradition has predominated which allows one, in certain circumstances, to delay circumcision until the twelfth day, while the Samaritans, as *Jubilees*, hold to the eighth day (*Jub.* 15:25). It is significant that the author cites Gen 17:14 (*Jub.* 15:14) according to the LXX and the Samaritan Pentateuch, which mentions the eight days, and not the MT or the Vulgata both of which omit the specific mention of the days in Gen 17:14.

Jub. *28:6*

> Laban said to Jacob: "It is not customary in our country to give the younger daughter before the older one." It is not right to do this because this is the way it is ordained and written on the heavenly tablets: that no one should give his younger daughter before his older one, but he should first give the older and after her the younger. Regarding the man who acts in this way they will enter a sin in heaven. There is no one who is just and does this because this action is evil in the Lord's presence.

Our text is completely silent concerning the prohibition stated in Lev 18:18 concerning the taking of two sisters as wives. This is an odd halakah which evidently has no biblical basis, and has as its purpose the justification of Jacob's conduct. In spite of the text (*Jub.* 28:7) urging Moses that he instruct the children of Israel about it, the halakah has not even found an echo in the rabbinic tradition, according to which, customs previous to the Mosaic revelation have ceased to be valid.

Jub. *30:9*

> For this is the way it has been ordained and written on the heavenly tablets regarding any descendant of Israel who defiles (it): "He is to die; he is to be stoned."

---

[22] Finkelstein, "The Book of Jubilees," 59: "It is far more likely that our author is following the Bible and is merely emphasizing the importance of the eight days as the proper time for the observance of the rite."

The authority of the "heavenly tablets" is invoked anew for the imposition of a halakah which has no biblical basis. In this case it permits the execution of whomever permits marriage with gentiles. *Jub.* 30:7 says:

> If there is a man in Israel who wishes to give his daughter or his sister to any foreigner, he is to die. He is to be stoned because he has done something sinful and shameful within Israel. The woman is to be burned because she has defiled the reputation of her father's house; she is to be uprooted from Israel.

Without doubt this passage deals with a halakah that is tremendously important for the author of *Jubilees*, since he begins by placing it in the mouth of Abraham (20:4), in the mouth of Rebecca (25:1), and to it is traced the misfortunes of Judah (41:2). This leads us to think that a situation of this type is also the origin of the same reaction of Ezra 9–10 and Neh 13:27. The precise formulation places it in relation to the abuse of Dinah and the justification of an interpretation of Lev 18:21; *Jub.* 20:2–4 is also in evidence in *Tg. Ps.-J.* to Lev 18:21. However, this interpretation is expressly criticized in rabbinic Judaism.[23] The Latin text clearly exhibits this interpretation, for it substitutes the biblical "Moloch," which is preserved in the Ethiopic text, for *alienigenae.* That the author distinguishes the "heavenly tablets" from the Torah in this case is evident in v. 11, in the order given to Moses—a clear allusion to Deut 7:3 and in the citation of Gen 34:14 in v. 12 as "words of the law." The biblical basis of the penalty imposed, that is, stoning, is deduced from the equivalence between delivering one's offspring to Moloch and delivering them to foreigners. The punishment of burning the woman can only be explained by a comparison with the Israelite woman who marries a foreigner to the daughter of a priest who prostitutes herself. In both cases the interpretation of the biblical text supposes, as does the halakah itself, that it can be accepted only by virtue of the authority that is conferred upon it by its inscription upon the "heavenly tablets."

Jub. *32:10–15*

> For this reason it is ordained as a law on the heavenly tablets to tithe a second time, to eat it before the Lord—year by year—in the place which has been chosen (as the site) where his name will reside. This law has no temporal limits forever. That statute has been written down so that it should

[23] Cf. *m. Meg.* 4:9 and the contrasting opinion of *b. Meg.* 25a.

> be carried out year by year—to eat the tithe a second time before the Lord in the place that has been chosen. One is not to leave any of it over from this year until the time of harvesting the seed of the year; the wine (will be drunk) until the time for the wine; and the olive (will be used) until the proper time of its season. Any of it that is left over and grows old is to be (considered) contaminated; it is to be burned up because it has become impure. In this way they are to eat it at the same time in the sanctuary; they are not to let it grow old. The entire tithe of cattle and sheep is holy to the Lord, and is to belong to the priests who will eat (it) before him year by year, because this is the way it is ordained and inscribed on the heavenly tablets regarding the tithe.

It is impossible to deal here with the complicated question of tithes in *Jubilees.* The first reference concerns the *maʿăśer šēnī*, the second tithe. It deals with, as Finkelstein claims,[24] a tithe on the tithe given to priests (which would assure an abolition of the traditional second tax, effectively instituting a new system) or a tithe on the balance, as indicated in Deut 14:22–23, as convincingly argued by Albeck.[25] The differences with the traditional halakah remain. It is interesting here that the appropriate halakah on tithes is legitimated through recourse to the "heavenly tablets," which justifies the exegesis that has been made upon a biblical basis. What is dealt with here is a controversial problem to which several distinct solutions were given. This is demonstrated by *Tg. Ps.-J.* to Deut 26:12–13, by the evidence of the two opposed opinions found in the two different Greek versions of Tob 1:7, by the statements of Josephus in *Ant.* 4.240, and by the tradition recorded in the Mishnah (*Soṭa* 9:10) which is attributed to John Hyrcanus who suppressed the institution of the *demai*[26] in 11QT[a] 43.

Conclusion

What conclusions are we able to bring out from this rapid review of these texts? The first is that the figure of the "heavenly tablets" does not represent a single notion. Its content is complex and diverse and cannot be reduced to a single one of its components. Another conclusion is the dependency of *Jubilees* upon the Enochic literature, from which is derived the notion of the "heavenly tablets" as a Book of Destiny in which is not only found the

---

[24] Finkelstein, "The Book of Jubilees," 52–53.

[25] Albeck, *Das Buch der Jubiläen und die Halacha*, 30–32.

[26] On this point, see L. Finkelstein, "Some Examples of the Maccabean Halaka," *JBL* 49 (1930): 20–42, esp. 32–37.

inscription of human evil or good, but the complete course of history. But the most important conclusion which has, at least to my knowledge, not been hitherto pointed out, is that in more than half of the cases in *Jubilees* where the expression "heavenly tablets" is used, it indicates that the "heavenly tablets" function in the same way as the Oral Torah (*tôrāh še-bĕ-ʿal peh*) in rabbinic Judaism. The "heavenly tablets" consitute a hermeneutical recourse which permits the presentation of the "correct" interpretation of the Law, adapting it to the changing situations of life.

Josephus, in his description of the differences between the Sadducees and the Pharisees, tells us:

> For the present I merely wish to explain that the Pharisees have passed on to the people certain regulations handed down by former generations and not recorded in the Laws of Moses, for which reason they are rejected by the Sadducaean group, who hold that only those regulations should be considered valid which were written down (in Scripture), and that those which had been handed down by former generations need not be observed. (*Ant.* 13.297, trans. R. Markus)

For the author of *Jubilees*, these prescriptions, which are not encountered in the Law of Moses, are authoritative and ought to be accepted in the same manner, because they too, like the Torah, are inscribed in the "heavenly tablets."

In the same way that rabbinic Judaism was preoccupied with establishing a "chain of tradition" which justified the transmission of the Oral Torah (*m. ʾAbot* 1:1), the author of *Jubilees* establishes a chain of transmission from the esoteric tradition preserving the contents of the "heavenly tablets" and transmits it.[27] In this chain of transmission his own work is inscribed.

Thanks to the "heavenly tablets," which are at once the pre-existing Torah, the Book of Destiny, and the Oral Torah, the author is not only able to rewrite history, but also able to interpret the present and establish a course of conduct that would secure the future.[28]

---

[27] The origin of the esoteric tradition is Enoch (*Jub.* 4:17–19). Enoch passed it on to Methuselah and he passed it on to Lamech (7:38–39). Lamech handed it on to Noah, who passed it on to Shem, "his firstborn" (10:13–14). In the corruption that followed the Flood, this knowledge remained hidden until it was revealed anew to Abraham along with the books of his ancestors (12:26–27), Abraham then transmitted this information to Isaac (21:1) and to Jacob (22:10–30; 25:5–7; 39:6), who in his turn handed it on to Levi in order that his descendents might preserve it (45:6).

[28] Translated by Michael Thomas Davis, Princeton, from "Las Tablas Celestes en el Libro de los Jubileos," in *Palabra y Vida: Homenaje a José Alonso Díaz en su 70 cumpleaños* (ed. A. Vargas Machuca and G. Ruiz; Publicaciones de la Universidad Pontificia Comillas Madrid, Series I. Estudios 58; Madrid: Ediciones Universidad de Comillas, 1984), 333–49.

CHAPTER FIVE

BALAAM IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

According to Martin Abegg's *Concordance*, Balaam appears once in the nonbiblical Qumran scrolls in Hebrew, in 4Q175 1 9,[1] and another time in an Aramaic text,[2] in 4Q339, on a list of the false prophets who arose in Israel, among whom "Balaam, son of Beor, the old man from Bethel" is the first.[3] However, if we look a little further than this meagre attestation, we may find that the use of the Balaam story at Qumran may help us develop our understanding of the biblical narrative, which is our central concern here.

When one looks at the basis of the narrative development, two different stories seem to be told in Num 22–24. In the one account, Balaam is considered in a rather positive light; his conduct is seen as blameless. He is not an Israelite of course but a kind of magician to whom "the money of divination" must be paid (Num 22:7). However, he does obey YHWH's orders and prophesizes what God commands him to. In the other account, following rabbinic tradition, Balaam has a thoroughly negative image: for example, he commits sodomy with his ass, loses his share in the world-to-come and harmful snakes arise from his rotten bones. Indeed, other biblical texts have been highly influential in the development of this negative image, such as Num 31:15–16 where Moses recalls the counsel attributed to Balaam, "Let the women do the work and Israelites will be defeated." In fact this negative image is very old since, according to Gilles Dorival in his commentary on Numbers in *La Bible d'Alexandrie*, the "demonisation" of Balaam is already evident in the Greek translation of Num 22–24: "La LXX de Nb est plus défavorable à Balaam que le TM: s'il est un inspiré, il n'est pas un prophète du Seigneur."[4]

Where in this development can we locate an image of Balaam that can be drawn from the Qumran scrolls? In order to find out, in this short

---

[1] M. G. Abegg, Jr., J. E. Bowley, and E. M. Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance*, Vol. 1: *The Non-Biblical Texts from Qumran* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 147.

[2] Ibid., 800.

[3] M. Broshi and A. Yardeni, *Qumran Cave 4. XIV Parabiblical Texts. Part 2* (DJD 19; Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), 77–79, pl. XI.

[4] G. Dorival, *Les Nombres* (BA 4; Paris: Cerf, 1994), 414.

note I will first explore the biblical texts of Num 22–24 found at Qumran in order to see if the development found in the LXX is already present. Secondly, I will touch on the well known messianic interpretation of the fourth oracle, i.e., Num 24:17, found in different nonbiblical texts from Qumran. This Qumran interpretation of the Balaam oracle has been so thoroughly studied that nothing new should be expected from my exposition. Nonetheless this interpretation is so important that in one way or another it should be included in our discussion.

1. Numbers 22–24 at Qumran

The three chapters of Numbers we are dealing with have been partially preserved in two manuscripts from Cave 4: 4Q23 (4QLev-Num^a),[5] which has preserved remains of Num 22:5–6, 22–24, and 4Q27 (4QNum^b),[6] which contains fragments of Num 22:5–21, 31–34, 37–38, 41; 23:1–4, 6, 13–15, 21–22, 27–30 and 24:1–10. 4QNum^b is a particularly interesting manuscript. Its textual affiliation is not easy to ascribe. In general, it seems closer to the Samaritan Pentateuch than to the LXX or the MT. It has nevertheless a series of interesting variants. Here are some examples although the readings are not always absolutely certain.

With regard to Num 22:6, both 4Q23 and 4Q27 read ממני with the first person suffix, and not the plural of the LXX ἡμεῖς.[7] In contrast, with regard to Num 22:11, 4Q27 has the same plus מן ארץ (= ἐκ τῆς γῆς) of LXX.[8]

With regard to Num 22:13, Dorival interprets the variant of the Greek as τὸν κύριον ὑμῶν, whereas the MT reads ארצכם, as a theological variant made by the translator: "La substitution de 'votre seigneur' à 'votre terre' est sans doute volontaire; il s'agit d'éviter que la terre qui doit revenir à Israël soit définie—même par Balaam—comme la proprieté des Moabites."[9] Dorival also thinks it is unlikely that the LXX could depend on a Hebrew model: "Il est difficile de croire que la LXX dépende d'un modèle qui, au lieu de ארצכם, offrait אדוניכמה."[10] 4Q27 is difficult to decipher, but

[5] Edited by Eugene Ulrich in E. Ulrich et al., *Qumran Cave 4. VII: Genesis to Numbers* (DJD 12; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 153–76, pls. XXIII–XXX (= DJD 12).

[6] Edited by Nathan Jastram in DJD 12:205–67, pls. XXXVIII–XLIX.

[7] DJD 12:171 and 230.

[8] DJD 12:231. Although only the final letter has been preserved, space requirements make the reading assured.

[9] Dorival, *Les Nombres*, 105.

[10] Ibid.

the most probable reading is the one by the editor:[11] אדוניכמה, a reading confirmed by the addition of עליו in the verse, which clearly refers to Balak as "their Lord."

With regard to Num 22:18, even if only the *lamed* has been preserved,[12] it seems clear that 4Q27 has the addition of בלבי which corresponds to the LXX addition of ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ μου. Commentators on the LXX usually explain the Greek addition as intended to harmonize with Num 24:13, although there it is translated by παρ' ἐμαυτοῦ, but now we have a Hebrew manuscript containing the same addition in Num 22:18.

With regard to Num 22:19, 4Q27 apparently contains a repetition of the expression used in Num 22:8, "and the princes of Moab stayed with Balaam:" though only the word שרי has been preserved.[13] Although this concrete addition is not found in the Samaritan Pentateuch, it corresponds to one of the characteristics of this textual family: importing parallels from other parts of the biblical texts.

With regard to Num 23:3, 4Q27 also has a lengthy addition, this time corresponding to the addition present in the LXX.[14] And at the end of the verse the MT reads only: וילך שפי, but the LXX has: καὶ παρέστη Βαλακ ἐπὶ τῆς θυσίας αὐτοῦ, καὶ Βαλααμ ἐπορεύθη ἐπερωτῆσαι τὸν θεὸν καὶ ἐπορεύθη εὐθεῖαν ("And Balak stood by his offering, and Balaam went off to ask God and went straight away"). 4Q27 has preserved a text that corresponds to the first part of the LXX addition: ו]ילך ויתיצב בלק על ע[ו]לתו ובלעם, "and went and stood by his holocaust, and Balaam . . ." Based on the available space in the manuscript, the editors assume that the entire addition is present. Whereas the MT describes only the intention of Balaam to go, our text also describes the fulfilment of this intention.

With regard to Num 23:4 in 4Q27, as in the Samaritan Pentateuch, it is not God himself who meets Balaam but his angel (מלאך אלוהים),[15] and consequently the editors have reconstructed the "angel" as the one who speaks to Balaam in Num 23:5.

With regard to Num 24:1, Jastram inserts the half verse found on 23:23 because of the space requirements of the reconstructed manuscript:[16] הנח]שים ביעקוב והקסמים בישראל, "(to look) for the omens in Jacob and

[11] DJD 12:231.
[12] Ibid. Only the top of the letter is visible, the rest has peeled off.
[13] Ibid. The word is completely preserved in frg. 21.
[14] DJD 12:234.
[15] Partially reconstructed, only *mem* and *lamed* have been preserved, cf. DJD 12:234.
[16] DJD 12:236.

presages in Israel." The variant cannot be proved, of course, but it would fit with the tendency of the manuscript to insert elements from other sections of the biblical text, as the Samaritan Pentateuch characteristically does, and is required by the המדבר פניו which appears in the next line.[17]

With regard to Num 24:6, it can be proven that our manuscript has נטה ("pitched") as in the Samaritan text, instead of the נטע ("planted") of the MT, assuring us that this metaphor was used by the LXX, that of the tent pitched or set up by the Lord (*σκηναί, ἃς ἔπηξεν*), and not of the aloe planted as in the MT.[18]

The last variant I want to note is on Num 24:9. I do not mean the simple exchange of כרע for כער for all other major witnesses, because this is evidently a simple error by the copyist who has interchanged *ʿayin* and *resh*, but the unique רבץ ("stretches out") for the MT שכב ("lies down") or the Greek *ἀνεπαύσατο* ("takes a rest"), because the same Hebrew verb is used in Gen 49:9 in the blessing of Judah by Jacob. In fact, with the use of this verb (the rest of the verse has not been preserved), our manuscript brings this verse of Numbers in line with the verse of Genesis, where we can read that Judah "crouches down, stretches out like a lion and like a lioness—who dares rouse him?" (כרע רבץ כאריה וכלביא מי יקימנו). This bringing in line with Gen 49:9 indicates, in my opinion, the secondary nature of this variant, but at the same time it introduces into the Balaam story the echoes of the blessing of Judah, which, we are going to see, plays an important role in the Qumran exegesis of Num 24:17.

To conclude this brief overview of the preserved variants in the Qumran manuscripts, we cannot say that the progressive "demonisation" of Balaam that Dorival sees in the Greek translation is already evident in our manuscripts. In spite of the shared variants, here the image of Balaam is closer to the positive representation found in the MT.

Unfortunately no remnants of the fourth oracle have been preserved. There is thus no way of finding out if some variants of the LXX and other textual families are attested to in the biblical copies of Numbers present at Qumran. We must go directly to the nonbiblical texts that quote or interpret the oracle, particularly Num 24:15–17, which deals with the sceptre and star prophecy.

---

[17] Ibid.

[18] The word is preserved in its entirety; the following יהוה has been inserted between the lines, see frg. 28.

2. The Sceptre and Star Prophecy

The longest of the three quotations of the fourth Balaam oracle in the sectarian texts from Qumran is found in 4Q175,[19] the so-called *Testimonia*, a unique sheet with four quotations on messianic figures, separated by *vacat*. This note does not give an explicit interpretation of the texts but the selection made indicates that these texts, independently of their original meaning, have been interpreted as messianic.[20]

The first text (lines 1–8) is taken from Exod 20:18 as found in the Samaritan version, a combination of Deut 5:28–29 and Deut 18:18–19 of the MT announcing the coming of a prophet like Moses, the eschatological prophet. The third text (lines 14–20) is taken from Deut 33:8–11 and is applied to the priestly messiah, as specified by the added introduction "And about Levi he says." The fourth text (lines 21–30) is taken from a composition found at Qumran preserved in two manuscripts (4Q378–379) and published under the title *4QApocryphon of Joshua*,[21] in which the reference to Josh 6:26 makes clear that the negative figure depicted there is the eschatological opponent of the messiahs: "an accursed man, a man of Belial." The second text (lines 9–13) comes from the fourth oracle of Balaam and is the one that interests us here. It is taken from Num 24:15–17 and, apart from the different orthography of many words, contains only a few differences from the MT or the Samaritan version. It reads בנבעור attached, but without the problematic *waw* of the MT. It introduces אשר after "who knows the knowledge of the Most High" that is not in the MT at that point, but which is present in the verse of Num 24:3, and which Num 24:15 simply repeats. The second time it uses the singular עין instead of the plural, perhaps to harmonize the expression with the previous singular also present in the MT. Perhaps the most interesting variant is the change in the form of the verb וקם of the MT for ויקום, not only because of the change of the temporal aspect, but because it has been inserted above

[19] Edited by J. M. Allegro, *Qumrân Cave 4. I* (*4Q158–4Q186*) (DJDJ 5; Oxford: Clarendon, 1968), 57–60, pl. XXI.

[20] The messianic interpretation of the passage is generally acknowledged. The only exception is the article by J. Lübbe, "A Reinterpretation of 4QTestimonia," *RevQ* 12/46 (1986): 187–97. For a synthetic treatment of the text, see J. Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran: Königliche, priesterliche und prophetische Messiasvorstellungen in den Schriftfunden von Qumran* (WUNT 2.104; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 428–36.

[21] Edited by C. Newsom, *Qumran Cave 4. XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3* (DJD 22; Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), 237–88, pls. XVII–XXV.

the line, which gives me the impression that it represents the thinking of the copyist.[22] The meaning of the quote is totally clear: for the collector of this series of quotes, the coming of a future royal messiah is announced in Balaam's oracle. It is equally clear that the two terms employed in the biblical text, "the star out of Jacob" and the "sceptre out of Israel," are applied to a single anticipated figure, the one who will "crush the temples of Moab and cut to pieces all the sons of Seth," a descendent of David who will rule as a victorious king in the eschatological era. In view of the age of the manuscript, I think we can consider this quote to be one of the older, if not the oldest, messianic interpretations of the biblical text, an interpretation that, since it appears in other contributions, will have great success in both Judaism and Christianity.[23]

The second quotation of Balaam's oracle at Qumran, taken from Num 24:17–19, is found in one of the battle hymns of 1QM 11:6–7,[24] where the quote is introduced as: כאשר הגדתה לנו מאז לאמור "Thus you taught us from ancient times saying." The first part of the quote (Num 24:17) is practically identical to the MT, with the omission of only the *waw* before קם; but in the quote of verses 18 and 19, though easily recognizable, the order of the stichs is different from all other versions. Elsewhere, we have translated the passage like this:[25]

> A star will depart from Jacob, a sceptre will be raised in Israel. It will smash the temples of Moab, it will destroy all the sons of Seth. It will come down

---

[22] The copyist of 4Q175 is the same one who penned 1QS, a fact that has led Xeravits to speculate that the copyist could have been the compiler of the *Testimonia*: "We may further note that the theological view to which the *Testimonia* seems to testify—the eschatological activity of three different protagonists—has only one other occurrence in the Qumran Library: 1QS IX 11, a passage written by the same scribe. This fact hypothetically allows us to suppose that the *Testimonia* could even have been compiled by this scribe, seeking to collect biblical passages supporting this theological concept." See G. G. Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet: Positive Eschatological Protagonists of the Qumran Library* (STDJ 47; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 58.

[23] See, e.g., S. Beyerle, "'A Star Shall Come out of Jacob': A Critical Evaluation of the Balaam oracle in the Context of Jewish Revolts in Roman Times," in *The Prestige of the Pagan Prophet Balaam in Judaism, Early Christianity and Islam* (ed. G. H. van Kooten and J. T. A. G. M. van Ruiten; TBN 11; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 163–88; A. Houtman and H. Sysling, "Balaam's Fourth Oracle (Numbers 24:15–19) According to the Aramaic Targum," ibid., 189–211; J. Leemans, " 'To Bless with a Mouth Bent on Cursing': Patristic Interpretations of Balaam (Num 24:17)," ibid., 287–99.

[24] Edited by E. L. Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1955), pls. 16–34.

[25] *DSST*, 104.

> from Jacob, it will exterminate the remnant of the city,[26] the enemy will be its possession,[27] and Israel will perform feats.[28]

Here we cannot deal with the textual form of the quotation.[29] What is interesting for our purpose is the meaning attributed to the quotation by the context in which it is placed, since it shows us how the text of Numbers was interpreted and to whom it was applied. The quote concludes the battle hymn to which previous liberations from enemies in the history of Israel were achieved by royal human agents with the help of God's might (Goliath is given unto David's hands in line 2, Israel is saved by the hands of the kings in line 3). Each victory is concluded with the cry, "For the battle is yours!" addressed to God. The Balaam oracle is adduced at the end, as a guarantee that the same will happen in the future final battle. The context does not specify if the "star out of Jacob" and the "sceptre out of Israel" are understood as one or two different figures, but the form of the final part of the quotation makes clear that the referent is only one, the royal messiah who will lead the people in the final battle. In this second quote we thus find the same messianic interpretation of the oracle that we found in the first quote.

The third perhaps most interesting and more often studied quotation of the same oracle is present in the first copy (MS A) of the *Damascus Document* from the Cairo Genizah[30] (CD 7:14–21; also partially preserved in 4Q266 3 iii 17–25 and 4Q269 5),[31] in the section known as the "Amos-Numbers Midrash" (CD 7:9–8:2). The passage is particularly complex because the second copy (MS B) of the Genizah text (pages 19–20) has preserved a rather different text, in which the quotations from Amos

---

[26] This is Num 24:19 in the MT.

[27] This is a summary of the two first stichs of Num 24:18, but eliminates the concrete references to Edom and Seir.

[28] This is the conclusion of Num 24:18.

[29] Jean Carmignac, who had written two long articles on the quotations of the Old Testament in 1QM ("Les citations de l'Ancient Testament dans 'La Guerre des Fils de Lumière contre les Fils de Ténèbres'," *RB* 63 [1956]: 234–60, 375–90), concludes in his translation of 1QM that Num 24:17–19 is quoted in a "difficilement intelligible" form. See J. Carmignac and P. Gilbert, *Les Textes de Qumran traduits et annotés I* (Autour de la Bible; Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1961), 109. For a synthetic presentation of the differences see A. S. van der Woude, *Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumrân* (SSN 3; Assen: van Gorcum, 1957), 119.

[30] Edited by S. Schechter, *Documents of Jewish Sectaries*, vol 1: *Fragments of a Zadokite Work* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1910; repr. New York: Ktav, 1970).

[31] The Qumran copies of the document were edited by J. M. Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4.XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266–273)* (DJD 18; Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), 23–93, pls. I–XVII and 123–39, pls. XXIII–XXV.

and Numbers are replaced by quotations from Zech 13:7 and Ezek 9:4 (CD 19:5–14). Both passages are certainly related and Chaim Rabin has edited an eclectic text relegating to an appendix editions of both texts as found in the two manuscripts.[32] The narrative frame is identical before and after the quotations, and both passages deal with future punishments for the unfaithful and rewards for the faithful. But the core part is different. In MS A the reasoning is explained by using a quotation from Isa 7:17 followed by Amos 5:26–27 and a subsidiary quotation from Amos 9:11; the quotation from Num 24:17 is split in two parts and applied to two different figures. In MS B the reasoning is explained using Zech 13:7 with a subsidiary quotation from Zech 11:11 and a quotation from Ezek 9:4. There have been many attempts to sort out the relationship between both passages.[33] Some scholars, starting with the groundbreaking work of Jerome Murphy-O'Connor,[34] modified later by Philip Davies[35] and further developed by George Brooke[36] and Michael Knibb,[37] have tried to explain the differences between both texts on the basis of redactional arguments. Some consider MS A the more original version, while others consider MS B as the more original. Other scholars, like S. White,[38] consider both texts original and explain the differences simply by text-critical methods, errors and omissions in both manuscripts, originated by double haplography. Both versions repeat identical or nearly identical phrases at certain places, for example: "and all who despise," "so as it is written," "were given up to the sword," "shall be delivered to the sword," "these escaped at the age of the visitation." Like other scholars, G. Xeravits combines both approaches (textual and redactional) in order to establish the relationship between the two parallel texts.[39] All these efforts have greatly contributed to our

---

[32] C. Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents* (2d ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1958), 28–36 and 78–80.

[33] The latest attempt known to me is by G. G. Xeravits, in his article "Précisions sur le texte original et le concept messianique de CD 7:13–8:1 et 19:5–14," *RevQ* 19/73 (1999): 47–59, and in his *King, Priest, Prophet*, 38–47.

[34] J. Murphy-O'Connor, "The Original Texts of CD 7:9–8:2=19:5–14," *HTR* 64 (1971): 379–86.

[35] P. R. Davies, *The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of the "Damascus Document"* (JSOTSup 25; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983), 143–72.

[36] G. J. Brooke, "The Amos-Numbers Midrash (CD 7,13b–8,1a) and Messianic Expectations," *ZAW* 92 (1980): 397–404.

[37] M. A. Knibb, "The Interpretation of Damascus Document VII,9b–VIII,2a and XIX,5b–14," *RevQ* 15/57–58 (1991): 243–51.

[38] S. A. White, "A Comparison of the 'A' and 'B' Manuscripts of the *Damascus Document*," *RevQ* 12/48 (1987): 537–53.

[39] See the works quoted in note 33.

understanding of the two midrashim, and the work will certainly continue in the future.[40] But I doubt that with the available evidence we will ever be able to solve the problem satisfactorily. The fragments from Cave 4 contain remnants of the Amos-Numbers midrash, but no trace of the Zechariah-Ezekiel midrash. Yet these remains are so fragmentary that no conclusion can be drawn from the absence. For our purpose, however, the matter is relatively unimportant, even if both texts contain somewhat different messianic ideas, since only MS A quotes Num 24:17.

In the translation of the *Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, the text of CD 7:9–8:1 reads as follows:[41]

> 9 But (for) all those who despise: when God visits the earth in order to empty over them the punishment of the wicked, 10 when there comes the word which is written in the words of Isaiah, son of Amoz, the prophet, 11 who said: *Isa 7:17* "There shall come upon you, upon your people and upon your father's house, days such as 12 have <not> come since Ephraim departed from Judah." When the two houses of Israel separated, 13 Ephraim detached itself from Judah, and all the renegades were delivered up to the sword; but those who remained steadfast 14 escaped to the land of the north. *Blank* As he said: *Amos 5:26–27* "I will deport the Sikkut or your King 15 and the Kiyyun of your images away from my tent to Damascus." *Blank* The books of the law are the Sukkat 16 of the King, as he said: *Amos 9:11* "I will lift up the fallen Sukkat of David." *Blank* The King 17 is the assembly; and the Kiyyune of the images "and the Kiyyun of the images" are the books of the prophets, 18 whose words Israel despised. *Blank* And the star is the Interpreter of the law, 19 who will come to Damascus, as is written: *Num 24:17* "A star moves out of Jacob, and a sceptre arises 20 out of Israel." The sceptre is the prince of the whole congregation and when he rises "he will destroy 21 all the sons of Seth." *Blank* These escaped at the time of the first visitation, while the renegades were delivered up to the sword.

Since I have previously commented on this text when dealing with the messianic expectations at Qumran,[42] here I will concentrate only on the elements directly concerned with the use of Balaam's oracle. The quotation from Num 24:17, here split in two, is introduced as justification of the

---

[40] See now S. Hultgren, "A New Literary Analysis of CD XIX–XX, Part I: CD XIX:1–32a (with CD VII:4b–VIII:18b). The Midrashim and the 'Princes of Judah'," *RevQ* 21/84 (2004): 549–78; idem, "A New Literary Analysis of CD XIX–XX, Part II: CD XIX:32b–XX:34. The Punctuation of CD XIX:33b–XX:1a and the Identity of the 'New Covenant'," *RevQ* 22/85 (2005): 7–32.

[41] *DSSSE*, 561.

[42] F. García Martínez, "Messianic Hope in the Qumran Writings," in F. García Martínez and J. Trebolle Barrera, *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 182–84.

previous explanation of the first quotation from Amos 5:26–27. In the text of Amos, the author chooses four words: סכות, המלך, כיון, and כוכב, and provides each one with an explanation, justified in two cases by secondary quotations. Though the Amos text as quoted differs in some instances from the MT, I think that the omission of the fourth element (כוכב; "the star") in the quotation is accidental and probably due to the mediaeval copyist, because without it there is no explanation for the introduction of the topic (the MT reads: כוכב אלהיכם אשר עשיתה לכם "the star of your God that you made for yourselves"). The Qumranic midrash, after having identified the "sukkat" with the books of the law, using a quotation from Amos 9:11 to prove the point, and after having equated the "King" with the assembly and the "Kiyyune" with the words of the prophets, goes on to identify the "star" with the Interpreter of the Law, an identification confirmed by the quotation of the first part of Num 24:17. This quotation, with its mention of שבט ("sceptre") besides "star," provokes a new identification, that of the "sceptre" with the "prince of the whole congregation" (נשיא כל העדה) whose arrival will cause the destruction of all the sons of Seth.

Here it is clear that Balaam's oracle is applied to two clearly distinct figures: the "star" which is identified with the "Interpreter of the Law" (והכוכב הוא דורש התורה), and the "sceptre," which is equated with the "prince of the whole congregation" (השבט הוא נשיא כל העדה). This dual application clearly distinguishes this use from the other two quotations, which apply the text to a single messianic figure.

As is well known, the problem with identifying the figure designated here as דורש התורה is the value that needs to be given to the participial form used in our text, i.e., הבא, which may refer to a figure of the past or to a figure of the future (as in our translation). In the first case, this figure would refer to the original "Interpreter of the Law" as in CD 4:7, where the same expression is applied to the founder of the group, also called the "Teacher of Righteousness." In the second case, this figure (whether or not a Teacher *redivivus*) would refer to an eschatological figure, which would carry messianic connotations. Since I am on record as a defender of this second position,[43] I will not rehearse the arguments again here. Suffice to say that the quotations from either Amos 9:11 or Num 24:17

[43] F. García Martínez, "Two Messianic Figures in the Qumran Texts," in *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. D. W. Parry and S. D. Ricks; STDJ 20; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 14–40.

are used consistently in an eschatological sense in the Qumran writings. We have previously mentioned the use of Num 24:17 in 4Q175 and in 1QM. Amos 9:11 is also used in a clearly eschatological context in 4Q174, known as the *Florilegium*.[44] In this text, which Steudel proved to be most probably part of an eschatological midrash,[45] we read in a comment on 2 Sam 7:12–14 (4Q174 1 i 11–12): "This (refers) to the 'branch of David' who will arise with the Interpreter of the Law who will rise in Zion in the last days, as it is written: 'I will raise up the hut of David which has fallen.' " Here סוכת דויד is not identified with "the books of the law" (as in CD), but with צמח דויד, the "branch of David," which is one of the titles of the royal messiah at Qumran (see also 4Q161 and 4Q252). And, more important, the דורש התורה will arise in Zion together with this messianic figure in the last days. Thus both figures should be in the same category: both are "messianic" and both are expected באחרית הימים. The quotation of Num 24:17 is thus used in the *Damascus Document* to express the anticipation of two eschatological figures.

The second of these figures, the "sceptre," is identified with the "prince of the whole congregation" (נשיא כל העדה), a well-known Qumranic designation for the royal messiah (see 4Q285 where he is identified with the צמח דויד, 4Q161 or even 1QM), to whom the blessing of 1QSb 5:20–29 is dedicated: למשכיל לברך את נשיא העדה.

By splitting the quotation in two and applying it to two different messianic figures, the interpretation given in the *Damascus Document* shows us that the same text could be used for different purposes. Its messianic value was not reduced to introduce the classic expectation of a Royal Messiah (as in *Testimonia*), but could also be put to the service of the different messianic conceptions developed within the community.

The quotation of Balaam's oracle in the *Damascus Document* is clearly different from the two we have analyzed, where the oracle is applied not to one messiah but two eschatological figures. However, the basic trust that God has spoken through Balaam, and that his words apply to the final salvation of Israel via (a) messianic figure(s), remains constant.

At the beginning of this note I stated that of the two references to Balaam in the nonbiblical scrolls from Qumran (in 4Q339), one makes him the first villain on a list of "false prophets who arose in Israel." This

---

[44] Edited by J. M. Allegro, DJDJ 5:53–57, pl. XIX–XX.

[45] A. Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde* (*4QMidrEschat*^{a,b}) (STDJ 13; Leiden: Brill, 1994).

text is thus witness to the progressive "demonisation" stated earlier in the LXX. Despite this, the prophecy of "Baalam, son of Beor, the old man from Bethel," as 4Q339 calls him, was not only accepted but used repeatedly in sectarian writings to express the diverse messianic expectations of the group.

CHAPTER SIX

DIVINE SONSHIP AT QUMRAN AND IN PHILO

I have recently completed a study of the concept of divine sonship at Qumran in which I looked at the three categories in which texts that speak of divine sonship in the Hebrew Bible are commonly grouped: (1) the angelic "sons of God"; (2) Israel, "*son* of God"; and (3) the king, "son of God." I wished to show, with the help of some selected texts, the progress (or the modifications) that we can register in the Dead Sea Scrolls in each one of these categories with respect to the idea of divine sonship.[1] To these three classical categories I have added a fourth that is not found in the Hebrew Bible, but which appears in some Qumranic texts: (4) the Messiah, "*son* of God."

In this short presentation I will give a summary of the conclusions of this study, and then proceed to compare these conclusions with some aspects of the idea of divine sonship I have found in the writings of Philo of Alexandria. The point of the exercise, as I understood it, was to look at the materials from Philo with the eyes of somebody trained in another field and used to reading other texts. First, then, the conclusions of the study of the Qumran texts.

1. Divine Sonship at Qumran

1.1. *The Angelic "Sons of God"*

The expression "sons of (the) God(s)" (בני [ה]אלהים),[2] used as a collective name to designate angelic beings in Gen 6:2, 4 and Job 1:6, 2:1,

[1] Now published as "Divine Sonship at Qumran: Between the Old and the New Testament," in *Biblical Traditions in Transmission: Essays in Honour of Michael* A. *Knibb* (ed. C. Hempel and J. M. Lieu; JSJSup 111; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 109–32; repr. in F. García Martínez, *Qumranica Minora II: Thematic Studies on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. E. J. C. Tigchelaar; STDJ 64; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 261–83.

[2] There is abundant literature on the topic. Among the classic studies, see W. Schlisske, *Gottessöhne und Gottessohn im Alten Testament: Phasen der Entmythisierung im Alten Testament* (BWANT 97; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1973). Among the more recent studies, see Mark S. Smith, The *Early History of God: Yahweh and the Other Deities in Ancient Israel* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1990).

and 28:7[3] is not used at Qumran, where it is usually replaced by "sons of heavens" (בני שמים), both in the Hebrew texts[4] and in the texts in Aramaic.[5]

In the Hebrew Bible, the divine sonship of the angels represents either an echo of the original plurality of divine beings, an adaptation of the Canaanite divine council, or the remains of an already surpassed mythology.[6] It was used more as a taxonomic element intended to underline its appurtenance to the celestial order and its distinction from the realm of humans than to indicate a father-son relationship. The occasional and very restricted survival of this terminology within the angelology of Qumran seems to have the same function. This appears most clearly when considering one of the most frequently used generic names for the angels: אלים (divine beings). The name appears more than 50 times (20 in the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*).[7] The name אלים underlines the heavenly nature of the angels, leaving aside the theme of divine sonship. The same happens with other divine names that are used of angels, including אלוהים.

At Qumran, the angels are not "sons of God," but their heavenly nature is strongly underlined.[8] On this point, the texts from Qumran are no different from the rest of the Jewish literature of the time and show the same general development of the angelology of the period.[9]

---

[3] And originally in Deut 32:8, as proved by a copy of Deuteronomy from Cave 4 (4Q37, 4QDeut[j]) which uses it (as the LXX) where MT has changed it to "sons of Israel." See E. Ulrich et al., *Qumran Cave 4.IX: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings* (DJD 14; Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), 90.

[4] See 1QS 4:22; 11:8; 1QH[a] 11:23; 23:30; 4Q181 1 2; 4Q416 1 12; 4Q418 2+2a-c, 4; 69 ii 12–13.

[5] See 1Q20 2:5, 16; 5:3–4; 6:11.

[6] See E. T. Mullen, *The Assembly of the Gods: The Divine Council in Canaanite and Early Hebrew Literature* (HSM 24; Chico: Scholars Press, 1980).

[7] See C. A. Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition* (HSS 27; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), 23–29.

[8] On Qumranic angelology see M. J. Davidson, *Angels at Qumran* (JSPSup 11; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992).

[9] See G. Delling, "Die Bezeichnung 'Söhne Gottes' in der jüdischen Literatur der hellenistisch-römischen Zeit," in *God's Christ and His People: Studies in Honour of Nils Alstrup Dahl* (ed. J. Jervell and W. A. Meeks; Oslo: Universitetsforlaget i Aarhus, 1977), 18–28; repr. in G. Delling, *Studien zum Frühjudentum: Gesammelte Aufsätze 1971–1987* (ed. C. Breytenbach and K.-W. Niebuhr; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 423–34; B. Byrne, "Sonship of God in the Intertestamental Literature," in "*Sons of God*"—"*Seed of Abraham*": *A Study of the Idea of the Sonship of God of All Christians in Paul against the Jewish Background* (AnBib 83; Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1979), 18–28. The most complete overview is given by M. Mach, *Entwicklungsstadien des jüdischen Engelglaubens in vorrabbinischer Zeit* (TSAJ 34; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992).

Other aspects of Qumran angelology, however, show us a clear development because they extend angelic characteristics to humans. This is the case, for example, of Noah who was "not like a man, but like the children of the angels of heaven,"[10] or of Moses, "who spoke like an angel with his mouth" (וכמלאך ידבר מפיהו) as it is said in 4Q377 1 ii 11,[11] or whom God "made . . . like a God" (יתננו לאלוהים[ו]), as it is asserted in 4Q374 2 ii 6.[12] At Qumran, a human person (an exceptional one, of course) can be equal to angelic beings, "the sons of God." And the same thing happens with the members of the group, the "sons of light," who are somehow equated with the angels.

The communion between angels and men is expressed in the texts as "sharing the lot" (גורל), a term that appears more than one hundred times in the preserved texts and that reveals the ultimate origin of this belief: the dualistic thinking of the group in which humanity is divided into two camps: "sons of light" and "sons of darkness."[13] In the eschatological war both "lots" are associated with the angelic host,[14] which is intended to endure forever,[15] and fight one against the other.[16] The language of election and inheritance used in these texts and the references to communal structures show us that this communion with the angelic world is the exclusive privilege of the members of the community who partake of the heavenly cult, fight together the eschatological battle, and use angelic language to express their community with the angelic "sons of God."

1.2. *Israel, "Son of God"*

The idea that a clan, a tribe or an entire people has a special relationship with its own god is something common in the Semitic world. This idea is frequently expressed with the metaphor of sonship, which does not intend to express any genetic relationship.[17] The themes which express

---

[10] As it is said in *1 En.* 106:5 and confirmed in 1QapGen 2:1.

[11] The text has been published by J. C. VanderKam and M. Brady in *Qumran Cave 4. XXVIII: Miscellanea, Part 2* (DJD 28; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001), 205–17, esp. 213.

[12] The text has been published by C. A. Newsom in *Qumran Cave 4. XIV: Parabiblical Texts 2* (DJD 19; Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), 99–110, esp. 102.

[13] See 1QS 3:13–4:26.

[14] The association of the impious with the host of evil angels is even expressed with the terminology of "sonship," since the expression בני בליעל "sons of Belial" is found five times: 4Q174 1:8; 4Q286 7 ii 6; 4Q386 1 ii 3; 4Q525 25 2; and 11Q11 6:3.

[15] See 1QS 11:7–8.

[16] See 1QM 1:10–11.

[17] The "canticle of Moses" in Deut 32 is a good example, with a significant concentration of the uses of the metaphor.

this special relationship of God with the people of Israel in terms of sonship are many, and all of them underline its metaphorical character: the father-creator,[18] the father-corrector,[19] the father-helper in danger,[20] and the father full of tenderness[21] are the most frequent. The motifs are formulated in terms of election, covenant, and the promise of inheritance (of the land of Israel). Exodus 4:22 expresses the same motif in terms of primogeniture: "Israel is my first-born son," and Jer 31:9 announces the renewal of this relationship in terms of the new covenant: "For I am ever a father to Israel, Ephraim is my first-born." Even in the most solemn and strong expression of the divine sonship of Israel in Deut 14:1 ("You are the children of YHWH your God," בנים אתם ליהוה אלהיכם), the rest of the sentence makes clear that the metaphor does not imply any genetic relationship but expresses rather the peculiar relationship of Israel with God in the context of election and the covenant: "For you are a people consecrated to YHWH your God: YHWH your God chose you (בחר) to be his treasured people from among all other peoples on earth."

The use of this metaphor continues, of course, in the Dead Sea Scrolls. In one of the prayers from the composition known as *Words of the Luminaries* (a prayer intended to be recited on Thursday) we read:[22]

> Behold, all the peoples are like nothing in front of you; they are reckoned as chaos and nothing in your presence. We have invoked only your name; for your glory you have created us; you have established us as your sons in the sight of all the peoples. For you called Israel "my son, my first born" and have corrected us as one corrects a son. (4Q504 1–2 iii 3–7)

Besides this reproduction of the data of the Hebrew Bible, I think that at Qumran we can ascertain two lines of development of the idea of the divine sonship of Israel. On the one hand, we can observe the use of the metaphor at an individual level to express the inner relationship with God, and not of Israel as such, but of a single person. On the other hand,

---

[18] E.g., Isa 64:7: "But now, YHWH, You are our father; we are the clay, and You are the potter. We are all the work of your hands."

[19] E.g., Deut 8:5: "Bear in mind that YHWH your God disciplines you just as a man disciplines his son."

[20] E.g., Wis 2:18: "For if the just one be the son of God, he will defend him and deliver him from the hand of his foes."

[21] E.g., Hos 11:1: "I fell in love with Israel, when he was still a child; and I have called (him) my son ever since Egypt."

[22] Published by M. Baillet, *Qumran Grotte 4. III* (DJD 7; Oxford: Clarendon, 1982), 137–77, translation by F. García Martínez, *DSST*, 414.

the extension of the divine sonship of Israel tends to be restricted to the members of the group only.

A good example of the first line of development is found in the *Apocryphon of Joseph* (4Q372)[23] where the protagonist appeals directly to the theme of sonship:

> And he said: "My father and my God (אבי ואלהי), do not abandon me into the hands of gentiles, do me justice, so that the poor and afflicted do not die . . . And your tenderness is great and great is your compassion for all who seek you; they are stronger than me and all my brothers who are associated with me." (4Q372 1:16–20)

The protagonist, the eponymous ancestor of the tribes of the North, presents himself in an anguishing situation, in exile, surrounded by enemies, and having recourse to God as saviour, appealing directly to the theme of "sonship." The narrative context of the composition as a whole makes clear that the patriarch represents the people and contains a clear polemic against the Samaritans and their pretension to being the true descendants of the patriarch. The true descendants of Joseph are, however, in a situation of exile, and in this situation each one of them may call upon God for salvation as Joseph did. This prayer, calling God "my father," has preserved the oldest attestation of the expression by a person other than David.[24]

Another text in which the same expression appears is 4Q460, where we can read at the end of a section: "[. . .] for you have not abandoned your servant (לעבדכה) [. . .] my Father and my Lord (אבי ואדוני)." The "servant" could be the collective Israel, of course; but it seems to me more likely that he is no other than the individual who speaks in the first person in line 2 of the fragment, who does something "in Israel" in line 3, and who considers himself a servant of God, to whom he appeals in line 6.[25]

These two texts and the references to God's paternity in the *Hodayot* illustrate the first of the two tendencies: the use of the theme of sonship to express the inner relationship with God *at a personal level.* The second tendency, *to restrict divine sonship to the members of the group* (the

---

[23] Published now by E. M. Schuller, *Qumran Cave 4. XXVIII* (DJD 28; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001), 165–97, as *4QNarrative and Poetic Composition.*

[24] The origin of the expression is to be found in אבי אתה אלי ישועתי וצור from Ps 89:27, which put it in the mouth of David, and corresponds to the use of "father" in the Nathan oracle, 2 Sam 7:14. On the position of this composition within the context of Second Temple prayers, see E. M. Schuller, "The Psalm of 4Q372 1 within the Context of Second Temple Prayer," *CBQ* 54 (1992): 67–79.

[25] 4Q460 9 i 5–6. The text has been published by E. Larson, *Qumran Cave 4. XXVI: Miscellanea, Part* 1 (DJD 36; Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), 382.

same to whom the divine angelic sonship has been extended), is a logical and unavoidable consequence of the premises articulated by two basic documents: the *Damascus Document* appropriates "Israel" as a designation of the group, and the *Rule of the Community* transforms the concept of covenant into "the covenant of the community." In other texts of a more eschatological character, such as the *War Scroll* or the *Rule of the Congregation*, after the destruction of all "sons of darkness," the "new covenant" and "the covenant of the community" will be co-extensive with "Israel" and it will form "all the congregation of Israel." At this moment, of course, all the sons of Israel will be "sons of light," and consequently "sons of God."[26]

1.3. *The King, "Son of God"*

In the Hebrew Bible the king is the only individual who is called "son of God." This special relationship of the king with God has been explained in many ways: as a divinization of the king, influenced by the model of Egyptian religion;[27] as due to the influence of the Assyro-Babylonian idea of the king as "image of God;"[28] as a result of the "divine adoption" of the king at the moment of his enthronement;[29] or as a simple intensification of the divine sonship of Israel within the context of the covenant.[30] Whatever the explanation, there is no doubt at all that this "divine sonship of the king" expresses a very peculiar relationship of the king with the divinity.[31]

---

[26] For a detailed treatment of this point, see F. García Martínez, "Invented Memory: the 'Other' in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in idem, *Qumranica Minora II*, 187–218.

[27] By H. Donner, "Adoption oder Legitimation? Erwägungen zur Adoption im Alten Testament auf dem Hintergrund der altorientalischen Rechte," *OrAnt* 8 (1969): 87–119; repr. in idem, *Aufsätze zum Alten Testament aus vier Jahrzehnten* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994); H. Merklein, "Ägyptische Einflüsse auf die messianische Sohn-Gottes-Aussage des Neuen Testaments," in *Geschichte-Tradition-Reflexion. Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag* (ed. H. Cancik, H. Lichtenberger, and P. Schafer; 3 vols.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 3:21–48, applies this idea to the New Testament.

[28] By J.-G. Heintz, "Royal Traits and Messianic Figures: A Thematic and Iconographic Approach," in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 52–66.

[29] By Roland de Vaux, "L'adoption divine," in *Les institutions de l'Ancien Testament* (Paris: Cerf, 1958), 1:171–73.

[30] By Byrne, "Sons of God"—"Seed of Abraham," 17–18.

[31] The topic has been studied from many different perspectives. See T. N. D. Mettinger, *King and Messiah: The Civil and Sacral Legitimation of the Israelite Kings* (Lund: Gleerup, 1976). The study of G. Cook, "The Israelite King as Son of God," *ZAW* 73 (1961): 202–25, in spite of its age, is still valuable.

The classic proof-texts with respect to this "divine sonship of the king" are those provided by the royal Psalms (Ps 2, Ps 110 [at least according to the interpretation of the LXX] and for some scholars Isa 9:1–6) on the one hand,[32] and on the other the oracle of Nathan on the Davidic dynasty preserved in 2 Sam 7:14, repeated in 1 Chron 17:13–14 and 22:10–11, and clearly evoked in Ps 89:27–30, to which 1 Chron 28:9–10 alludes when David transmits the instructions for the building of the temple to Solomon, and 2 Chron 7:17–20 after the dedication of the temple.[33]

At Qumran we find some echoes of these biblical texts on the divine sonship of the king, but *the motif of divine sonship itself has disappeared*. In the *Words of the Luminaries*, for example, there is a clear allusion to Nathan's oracle without the language of sonship:[34]

> And you chose the land of Judah and established your covenant with David so that he would be like a shepherd, a prince over your people, and would sit in front of you on the throne of Israel forever. (4Q504 1–2 iv 6–8)

On the other hand, we find other texts, such as 4Q174,[35] where the language of sonship of the biblical text has been preserved, but where the biblical text is applied *not to an existent king but to the king expected at the end of times*:

> And "YHWH declares to you that he will build you a house. I will raise up your seed after you and establish the throne of his kingdom for ever. I will be a father to him and he will be a son to me." This (refers to the) "branch of David" who will arise with the Interpreter of the law who will rise up in Zion in the last days. (4Q174 1–3 i 10–12)[36]

These texts prove that the mythological language of the royal Psalms and the dynastic oracle of Nathan have provided the textual basis for the

---

[32] For a classic statement on the royal ideology of Israel in its oriental context, see S. Mowinckel, *He That Cometh* (trans. G. W. Anderson; Nashville: Abingdon, 1955; repr. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2005), and his *The Psalms in Israel's Worship* (2 vols.; Nashville: Abingdon, 1962).

[33] The most complete study of the dynastic oracle and of its interpretation is K. E. Pomykala, *The Davidic Dynasty Tradition in Early Judaism* (SBLEJL 7; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998).

[34] Edited by M. Baillet, *Qumran Grotte 4.III* (DJD 7; Oxford: Clarendon, 1982), 143–44; translation by García Martínez, *DSST*, 415.

[35] Published by J. M. Allegro, *Qumran Cave 4.I* (DJDJ 5; Oxford: Clarendon, 1968), 53–57. See the study by G. J. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context* (JSOTSup 29; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1985). The text is now considered to be part of a larger composition, part of which is also 4Q177; see A. Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde* (*4QMidrEschat*^{a,b}) (STDJ 13; Leiden: Brill, 1994).

[36] García Martínez, *DSST*, 136.

development of the messianic idea also at Qumran, and have contributed definitely to the formulation of the expectation "at the end of times" of a royal Messiah, "son of God."

The last category of texts to be dealt with refers, in my opinion, to the same figure, also using the language of sonship, thereby allowing us to suggest that the title "son of God" could also be used as a messianic title at Qumran.

1.4. *The Messiah, "Son of God"*

The first of the texts which applies the language of divine sonship to the expected "anointed" is a disputed text in the *Rule of the Congregation* (1QSa 2:11–14): "This is the assembly of the famous men, [those summoned to] the gathering of the community when [God] begets the Messiah with them."[37] According to this reading and reconstruction of the text, the language of sonship is applied directly to the expected Messiah, who is "begotten" or "fathered" by God within the community. The key word, יוליד, is of uncertain reading and is very much disputed.[38] In my opinion, however, it represents the best reading and in view of the use of ילדתיך in Ps 2, it is quite normal.

The next text (4Q369) is unproblematic in terms of uncertain readings, but its fragmentary character leaves us uncertain as to whom the language of sonship (indicated by the use of בן בכור "first born," the phrase "and

[37] The text was edited by D. Barthélemy in *Qumran Cave 1* (DJD 1; Oxford: Clarendon, 1955), 108–18. Translation in *DSST*, 127.

[38] The reading יוליד is the one of the first editor, Barthélemy, and the excellent photographs in my possession confirm it. But Barthélemy, following a suggestion of Milik, understands the word as a copyist's error for יוליך, which would give to the whole sentence the meaning "au cas où Dieu mènerait le Messie avec eux" (DJD 1:117). Y. Yadin, "A Crucial Passage of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *JBL* 78 (1959): 238–41, reads יועדו, and J. Licht, *The Rule Scroll: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea* (Jerusalem: Bialik, 1965) [Hebrew], 27, lists eight different readings and prefers יתועדו "will unite," which is the reading followed by L. H Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Study of the Rule of the Congregation* (SBLMS 38; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 53–54. E. Puech, "Préséance sacerdotale et Messie-Roi dans la Règle de la Congrégation (1QSa ii 11–12)," *RevQ* 16/63 (1996): 351–65, proposes to read יתגלה and interprets the sentence "quand sera révélé le Prince Messie parmi eux." H. Stegemann, "Some Remarks to 1QSa, to 1QSb and to Qumran Messianism," *RevQ* 17/65–68 (1996): 478–505, suggests to read יואכלו, "When they eat together, and the messiah is together with them." All these readings seem to me very difficult palaeographically, and clearly inferior to the original reading of the first editor.

you made him for you a first-born son," and the expression כאב לבנו "like a father to his son") is being applied.[39]

Two different interpretations of the protagonist's identity have been proposed. The first sees him as an individual figure that will arise to guide and rule the Israel of the end of times.[40] The second sees this figure as a collective expression for Israel.[41] The strongest argument with respect to this collective interpretation is the use of בני בכרי in Exod 4:22, and the application in ancient Jewish literature of some of the motifs that appear in our text to Israel. The strongest argument with respect to the individual and messianic interpretation is the influence of Ps 89:27–28, where we find three of the elements appearing in the text applied to the king: God will make him "first-born" (בכור), he will establish him as the most exalted king on earth, and the king will call God "father." If we add to these elements from Ps 89 a possible parallel with another fragmentary Qumran text where the same expression בכרי also appears, I think that the balance ultimately inclines us towards the individual and messianic interpretation.

In 4Q458, published as *4QNarrative A*,[42] the expression appears without any context. In the best preserved fragments (4Q458 1), however, we find another expression, "the beloved" (לידיד, in line 1, and הידיד in line 2), which could refer to the same personage, as well as the expression "anointed with the oil of kingship" משיח בשמן מלכות (4Q458 2 ii 6) which clearly refers to the royal Messiah, because, as the editor notes,

---

[39] 4Q369 1 ii 4–10. The text has been edited by H. Attridge and J. Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4.VIII: Parabiblical Texts Part* 1 (DJD 13; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 356–57.

[40] The editors remark: "The prayer or prophecy mentions a place, most likely Jerusalem, and a 'prince' or 'ruler' (cf. line 7) whose identity remains obscure. If there is only one figure involved, he is to 'establish God's name' in a special place (line 1); have descendants who will have an eternal possession (line 4); be purified by God's judgments (line 5); enjoy the status of God's son (line 6), as well as heavenly glory (line 8). Such an individual may be either a biblical figure such as Abraham or David, or, more likely, an eschatological messianic figure" (DJD 13:358). The messianic interpretation has been defended strongly by C. A. Evans, "A Note on the 'First-Born Son' of 4Q369," *DSD* 2 (1995): 185–201 and in "Are the 'Son' Texts at Qumran Messianic? Reflections on 4Q369 and Related Scrolls," in *Qumran-Messianism* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth et al.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 135–53. Also by M. Philonenko, "De la 'Prière de Jésu' au 'Notre Père' (*Abba,* targoum du Psaume 89,27; 4Q369 1,2 1–12; *Luc* 11,2)," *RHPR* 77 (1997): 133–40, and G. G. Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet: Positive Eschatological Protagonists in the Qumran Library* (STDJ 47; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 89–94.

[41] Strongly defended by J. L. Kugel, "4Q369 'Prayer of Enosh' and Ancient Biblical Interpretation," *DSD* 5 (1998): 119–48.

[42] 4Q458 has been published by E. Larson, *Qumran Cave 4. XXVI: Miscellanea, Part* 1 (DJD 36; Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), 353–65.

"the establishment of his kingdom is apparently connected with both the destruction of the uncircumcised referred to in line 4 and the establishment of righteousness among the chosen people of God."[43] In spite of the uncertainties brought about by poor preservation, therefore, these texts also show that the language of sonship was applied to the royal Messiah as an extension of the sonship language originally applied to the king.

Also 4Q246, the famous "son of God" text, now published under the official title *4QApocryphe de Daniel ar*, applies the language of sonship to the Messiah:

> He will be called son of God, and they will call him son of the Most High . . . His kingdom will be an eternal kingdom, and all his paths in truth and uprightness. The earth (will be) in truth and all will make peace. (4Q246 1 ii 1–6)[44]

Although the word "anointed" does not appear in this Aramaic text, the messianic interpretation of its exalted protagonist is now generally accepted.[45] Together with the other texts quoted, 4Q246 offers us the proof not only that the sonship terminology of the king as "son of God" was transferred to the future Messiah at Qumran, but that the title "son of God" could be applied to the Messiah without the need to specify its character as "anointed."

The analysis of the Qumran texts on divine sonship shows that it is applied to selected individuals, that it is extended to the individual members of the community, that it is not used of historical kings but applied to the expected eschatological king, and that it has become one of the characteristics of the expected King Messiah. What about Philo? We now turn to look to him for elements which develop or add some new aspects to the idea of sonship in the Hebrew Bible.

---

[43] Ibid., 360.

[44] Published by E. Puech in *Qumran Cave* 4. *XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part* 3 (DJD 22; Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), 165–84.

[45] See the presentation of part of the very abundant bibliography originated by the text (before and after the official publication) in J. Zimmermann, "Observations on 4Q246—The 'Son of God,'" in *Qumran Messianism* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth et al.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 175–90. In the same volume J. J. Collins strongly defends the messianic character of the text in the section "Messiah and Son of God" (107–12) of his contribution, "Jesus, Messianism and the Dead Sea Scrolls," 100–119. Even the editor of the fragment, who in the official edition left open the possibility of a negative interpretation of the protagonist, accepts now its messianic character: E. Puech, "Le 'Fils de Dieu' en 4Q246," *ErIsr* 26 (1999): 143–52 (FS F. M. Cross): "Ceux-ci conviennent mieux, il faut le reconnaître, au roi messie, ainsi que la séquence en rapport avec la victoire eschatologique du roi avec la victoire de son peuple, car il n'y a pas de royaume sans roi" (149).

2. Divine Sonship in Philo

As a result of the influx of Greek philosophical ideas and Roman juridical praxis, sonship in Philo is a much more complex phenomenon than in the Hebrew Bible.[46] Perhaps the most complete typology of sonship is the one given in *Mut.* 147, when Philo comments on Gen 17:16, the promise of God to give Abraham a son (τέκνον):[47]

> So much for His saying that He will give one, but the word actually used in this passage, "bairn" (τέκνον), is used not without care or consideration. He wishes to show that the child is not alien (ἀθνεῖον) or suppositious (ὑποβολιμαῖον), nor again adopted (θετόν) or bastard (νόθον), but the truly genuine (γνήσιον) and free-natured offspring (ἀστεῖον) of a free-born soul. For "bairn" (τέκνον) derived from "bearing" (τόκον) is used to bring out the affinity which is the natural tie between parents and children. (*Mut.* 147)

No less than six adjectives are referred here to the word "child" ("bairn" in the PLCL translation), covering the whole gradation from ἀθνεῖος "alien" to γνήσιος "genuine." An important position in the list is taken by θετός, the "adopted," which represents a category unknown in the Hebrew Bible, but that Philo will use to attribute divine sonship to select individuals.[48] The best known case is Abraham.[49] In a famous passage in *Sobr.* 56, Philo writes, using different terminology:[50]

> And therefore He says plainly of Abraham, "shall I hide anything from Abraham My friend?" (Gen 18:17). But he who has this portion has passed beyond the bounds of human happiness. He alone is nobly born, for he has *registered God as his father* and become *by adoption His only son* (ἅτε θεὸν ἐπιγεγραμμένος πατέρα καὶ γεγονὼς εἰσποιητὸς αὐτῷ μόνος υἱός). (*Sobr.* 56)

---

[46] For an excellent overview of sonship in Philo, see Cristina Termini, "Tipologías de filiacíon en Filón de Alejandría," in *Filiación: Cultura pagana, religión de Israel, orígenes del Cristianismo* (ed. J. J. Ayán Calvo et al.; Estructuras y procesos: Serie Religión; Madrid: Trotta, 2005), 131–67.

[47] Translations are taken from PLCL, here 5:217–19.

[48] For a detailed analysis of the terminology of adoption, see J. M. Scott, *Adoption as Sons of God: An Exegetical Investigation into the Background of ΥΙΟΘΕΣΙΑ in the Pauline Corpus* (WUNT 2.48; Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 1992), 13–57; see 39–45 for the word group τίθεσθαι. Philo uses the adjective θετός also in *Agr.* 6, *Congr.* 23, and *Flacc.* 9.

[49] See S. Sandmel, *Philo's Place in Judaism: A Study of the Conceptions of Abraham in Jewish Literature* (augm. ed.; New York: Ktav, 1971).

[50] PLCL 3:473.

The topic of divine adoption in Philo in general, and the example of Abraham in particular, has been amply studied and needs no further comment.[51] I will simply underline the parallel with the "angelification" of selected individuals we have found in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Philo uses here the Graeco-Roman category of adoption to achieve the same results that the Scrolls have reached by applying angelic language to select individuals (and to the members of the community).

Together with divine adoption, the two most innovative elements (in my opinion) in the theme of divine sonship in Philo are the consideration of the cosmos as son of God, and his description of the Logos as πρωτόγονος. I will briefly comment on both.

2.1. *The Cosmos as Son of God*

Philo is well aware of the potentiality of the metaphor of sonship. In *Deus* 31 he applies it both to the sensible world and to the intelligible world, the κόσμος νοητός.[52] We can read there:

> For this universe, since we perceive it by our senses, is the younger Son of God (νεώτερος υἱὸς θεοῦ). To the elder son, I mean the intelligible universe, He assigned the place of first-born, (τὸν γὰρ πρεσβύτερον—νοητὸς δ' ἐκεῖνος) and purposed that it should remain in His own keeping. (*Deus* 31)[53]

The distinction between the two worlds is clear and it serves to underline not a chronological priority (time belongs only to the sensible word), but the fact that the intelligible world derives directly from the first cause and remains in God.[54] But this priority of the intelligible world does not imply that the sensible world is without value. In another text, Philo quotes Prov 8:22 to associate wisdom with the generation of the sensible world, which he calls "beloved," ἀγαπητός:

> The Architect (δημιουργός) who made this universe was at the same time the father of what was thus born, whilst its mother was the knowledge possessed by its Maker. With His knowledge God had union, not as men have it, and begat created being. And knowledge, having received the divine seed,

---

[51] See the treatment by Scott, *Adoption*, 88–96 and Termini, "Tipologías," 135–40.

[52] On the Philonic expression, see the comments of D. T. Runia, *On the Creation of the Cosmos according to* Moses (PACS 1; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 136.

[53] PLCL 3:25–27.

[54] See the excursus of Runia, *On the Creation of the Cosmos*, 151–52, and in more detail his *Philo of Alexandria and the* Timaeus *of Plato* (Philosophia Antiqua 44; Leiden: Brill, 1986).

> when her travail was consummated bore the only beloved son who is apprehended by the senses, the world which we see. (*Ebr.* 30–31)[55]

Here Philo mixes the usual metaphor of the Hebrew Bible (God as Maker of the World) with the metaphor of fatherhood and the language of sonship, which in the Bible is never applied to the creation of the world. In the same way that the Greco-Roman idea of adoptive sonship has allowed him to qualify Abraham as son of God, Greek philosophical ideas have provided the basis for the application of the idea of sonship to the world. This is not a general assumption, but in this case can be proved directly with a quote. In the brief summary of the *Timaeus* of Plato that Philo has included in *Aet. 15* we can read:

> But this subtlety of theirs is not so good or true an idea as the view before mentioned, not merely because throughout the whole treatise he speaks of the great Framer of deities (τὸν θεοπλάστην) as the Father and Maker and Artificer (πατέρα μὲν καὶ ποιητὴν καὶ δημιουργόν) and this world as His work and offspring (ἔργον δὲ καὶ ἔγγονον) a sensible copy of the archetypal and intelligent model. (*Aet.* 15)[56]

We can only guess the reasons why Philo (who, as Runia indicates, clearly prefers the biblical metaphor of the "maker," ποιητής, which underlines the difference between creator and creature and the relationship between the sensible world as a copy of the intelligible world)[57] introduces also the metaphor of the cosmos as son of God. But the more dynamic metaphor of a father-son relationship certainly allows him to introduce the possibility of a return to God. As he says in *Spec.* 1:41:

> This universe has been my teacher, to bring me to the knowledge that Thou art and dost subsist. As Thy son, it has told me of its Father, as Thy work of its contriver (καὶ ὡς υἱὸς ἀναδιδάξας με περὶ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ ὡς ἔργον περὶ τοῦ τεχνίτου).[58]

2.2. *The Logos πρωτόγονος*

The last element of Philo's use of the language of sonship I wanted to underline is his qualification of the Logos as "first-born," πρωτόγονος, a qualification that is closely related to his definition of the intelligible world as "older son" because the intelligible world is in the Logos and

---

[55] PLCL 3:333–35.
[56] PLCL 9:195.
[57] Runia, *Philo of Alexandria and the* Timaeus *of Plato*, 424.
[58] PLCL 7:123.

somehow is identical with the Logos, though without exhausting it. "In the same way the cosmos composed of the ideas would have no other place than the divine Logos who gives these (ideas) their ordered disposition," it is said in *Opif.* 20 in Runia's translation.[59]

For the Logos Philo uses only the specific title πρωτόγονος, avoiding the use of the Biblical πρωτότοκος (the LXX translation of the Hebrew בכור), which he reserves for the firstborn of men and animals. Philo gives this title to the Logos when describing some of its more important functions.[60] In *Agr.* 51, quoting Ps 23, he says:

> This hallowed flock He leads in accordance with right and law, setting over it His true Word and Firstborn Son (αὐτοῦ λόγον καὶ πρωτόγονον υἱόν) Who shall take upon Him its government like some viceroy of a great King; for it is said in certain place: "Behold I AM, I send My Angel before thy face to guard thee in the way" (Exod 23:20). (*Agr.* 51)[61]

The function here attributed to the Logos, the first-born son, is that of guidance of the cosmos as ὕπαρχος of God, who is the Shepherd of the whole universe. The use of Exod 23:20 as a proof text for this idea is interesting, because the function of the Angel/Logos is no longer to guide and protect the people of Israel through the desert, but to conduct κατὰ δίκην καὶ νόμον the whole cosmos as God's lieutenant.

In *Conf.* 62–63, one of the few texts in which the Logos is presented as acting as Demiurge, Philo comments on Zech 4:12, and playing with the double meaning of the Greek translation of *ṣemaḥ*, ἀνατολή, he says of the Logos:

> But if you suppose that it is that Incorporeal one (ἀσώματον ἐκεῖνον), who differs not a whit from the divine image, you will argue that the name of "rising" (ἀνατολή) assigned to him quite truly describes him. For that man is the eldest son (πρεσβύτατον υἱόν), whom the Father of all raised up, and elsewhere calls him His first-born (πρωτόγονον), and indeed the Son thus begotten followed the ways of his Father, and shaped the different kinds, looking to the archetypal patterns which the Father supplied. (*Conf.* 62–63)[62]

---

[59] Runia, *On the Creation of the Cosmos*, 51, and see his comments, 142–43.

[60] It is used in *Post.* 63; *Agr.* 51; *Conf.* 63, 146; *Fug.* 208; *Somn.* 1:215. See P. Borgen et al., *The Philo Index: A Complete Greek Word Index* to *the Writings of Philo of Alexandria* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2000), 303.

[61] PLCL 3:135.

[62] PLCL 4:45.

The Logos is "begotten" (γεννηθείς) by God and acts imitating (μιμούμενος) the divine way. Its function here is to shape the individual species following divine models.

Finally, Philo uses the same title of πρωτόγονος when describing the priestly functions of the Logos, as High Priest who brings the cosmos to God. We can read in *Somn.* 1:215:

> For there are, as it is evident, two temples of God: one of them this universe, in which there is also as High Priest His First-born, the divine Word (ἀρχιερεὺς ὁ πρωτόγονος αὐτοῦ θεῖος λόγος), and the other the rational soul, whose Priest is the real Man (ἕτερον δὲ λογικὴ ψυχή, ἧς ἱερεὺς ὁ πρὸς ἀλήθειαν ἄνθρωπος).[63]

And, of course, in the beautiful passage *Conf.* 145–147, where the many names of the Logos are listed, πρωτόγονος is the first one. And this Logos will play an essential role as mediator in the intellectual, moral and religious transformation of men, which makes them sons of God. But the analysis of this beautiful passage must to be left for others who are more competent.[64]

---

[63] PLCL 5:413.

[64] This paper was presented at the meeting of the Philo seminar in Philadelphia and intends to start conversations across disciplines. I thank Hindy Najman for her kind invitation to participate in the discussion.

C. TARGUMIC INTERPRETATIONS

CHAPTER SEVEN

EVE'S CHILDREN IN THE TARGUMIM

Only a few of the many traditions about Eve's children that can be gleaned from even a cursory reading of the Palestinian Targumim on Genesis will be presented here. The denial of Adam being the father of Cain by the *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* (henceforth *Pseudo-Jonathan*) is perhaps the best known of all these traditions.[1] Since our topic is not "Adam's children" but Eve's, it seems fitting to start this essay by re-examining this well-known topic. At any rate, this is a very old tradition, traces of which can arguably be found underlying the well-known Qumran poem on the "one who is pregnant of the serpent,"[2] and behind the 1 John 3:12

---

[1] In the numerous studies on the different traditions of the children of Eve, the matter of Cain's true paternity has received particular attention. See, e.g., A. Goldberg, "Kain: Sohn des Menschen oder Sohn der Schlange?" *Jud* 25 (1969): 203–21; repr. in *Mystik und Theologie des rabbinischen Judentums: Gesammelte Studien I* (ed. M. Schlüter and P. Schäfer; TSAJ 61; Tübingen: Mohr, 1997), 275–88. On the biblical narrative of Cain and Abel, see C. Westermann, "Kain und Abel, die biblische Erzähling," in his *Erträge der Forschung am Alten Testament: Gesammelte Studien III* (München: Kaiser, 1984), 39–53; on other traditions about Cain and Abel, see J. L. Kugel, "Cain and Abel in Fact and Fable," in *Hebrew Bible or Old Testament? Studying the Bible in Judaism and Christianity* (ed. R. Brooks and J. J. Collins; Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989), 167–90; on the Muslim Cain and Abel traditions, see L. Grattepanche, "Cain and Abel dans les légendes islamiques," *OLP* 24 (1993): 133–42. See also my "Caín, su padre, y el origen del Mal," in *Palabra, prodigio, poesía: In memoriam P. Luis Alonso Schökel, S.J.* (ed. V. Collado Bertomeu; AnBib 151; Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2003), 17–35, which in part overlaps with the present chapter, but also includes a discussion of the appearance of Samael in *Tg. Ps.-J. Gen.* 3:6.

[2] 1QH^a 11:6–19 (Suk. III 5–18). This poem, which opposes the woman giving birth to "a wonderful counsellor with his strength" to the woman giving birth to "all deeds of terror" has been extensively studied and variously interpreted. See, among others, A. Dupont-Sommer, "La mère du Messie et la mère de l'aspic dans un hymne de Qumran (DST iii,6–18)," *RHR* 147 (1955): 174–88; L. H. Silberman, "Language and Structure in the *Hodayot* (1QH 3)," *JBL* 75 (1956): 96–106; M. Delcor, "Un psaume messianique de Qumran," in *Mélanges bibliques rédigés en l'honneur d'André Robert* (Paris: Bloud & Gay, 1957), 334–40; O. Betz, "Das Volk seiner Kraft: Zur Auslegung der Qumran-Hodajah III,1–18," *NTS* 5 (1958–59): 65–75; P. S. Brown, "Deliverance from the Crucible: Some Further Reflections on 1QH III,1–18," *NTS* 14 (1967–68): 247–59; E. M. Laperrousaz, "La mère du Messie et la mère de l'aspic dans les "hymnes" de Qumrân: Quelques remarques sur la structure de "1QH" III,1–18," in *Mélanges d'histoire des religions offerts à Henri-Charles Puech* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1974), 173–85. For a full bibliography of this poem, see E. M. Schuller and L. DiTomasso, "A Bibliography of the Hodayoth, 1948–1996," *DSD* 4 (1997): 70–72.

reference to Cain "who *was from the evil one* and murdered his brother,"[3] which assures us of the tradition's antiquity. Since this tradition concerning the origins of Cain was apparently obtained by an exegesis of the biblical text that was shared by different Gnostic groups,[4] it can serve as a link to other interpretations of the same biblical narrative.

In this paper, I shall first examine the Aramaic translation of Gen 4:1 in *Pseudo-Jonathan*, which informs us who Cain's father was. Then I shall comment briefly on *Pseudo-Jonathan*'s translation of Gen 4:2 and on the other children of Eve. The third part of the paper will be a reading of a targumic *tosefta* in which Eve's daughters play a leading role.

1. Cain's Father

The Hebrew text of Gen 4:1, which narrates Cain's birth, is fairly straightforward. It contains, nevertheless, the inevitable elements of incongruity and ambiguity which always stimulate the ingenuity of the interpreters and give rise to all sort of interpretations. The Hebrew text of Gen 4:1 is usually translated: "And Adam (or "the man," because of the presence of the article האדם) knew Eve, his wife, and she conceived and bore Cain; and she said: קניתי איש את יהוה."

Eve's exclamation, which I have left untranslated, supplies us with a reasonably elaborate etymology of the name.[5] But the expression used is somehow incongruous because it designates the newborn babe neither

---

[3] New Testament scholars are divided as to the concrete meaning of the expression in this case. All of them recognise that ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ is the equivalent of the expression τέκνα τοῦ διαβόλου ("children of the devil") of 1 John 3:10, who are the antithesis of the τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ ("children of God") of the same verse; but while some, e.g., G. Strecker, *The Johannine Letters: A Commentary on 1, 2, and 3 John* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996), 105, interpret the expression in an ethical sense, in light of Origen (*Homily on Ezekiel* 9:1 "Omnis enim qui facit peccatum, ex diabolo natus est"), others, e.g., R. E. Brown, *The Epistles of John* (AB; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1982), 442–43 read the text in light of the Jewish Cainitic traditions. See T. C. de Kruif, "Nicht wie Kain (der) vom Bösen war . . . (1 Joh 3,13)," *Bijdr* 41 (1980): 47–63. On the related text from John 8:44, see N. A. Dahl, "Die Erstgeborene Satans und der Vater des Teufels (Polyk. 7:1 und Joh 8:44," in *Apophoreta: Festschrift für Ernst Haenchen zu seinem 70. Geburtstag am 10. Dezember 1964* (ed. W. Eltester; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1964), 70–84 and G. Reim, "John. 8:44—Gotteskinder-Teufelskinder," *NTS* 30 (1984): 619–24.

[4] See G. P. Luttikhuizen, "Gnostic Ideas About Eve's Children and the Salvation of Humanity," in *Eve's Children: The Biblical Stories Retold and Interpreted in Jewish and Christian Traditions* (ed. G. P. Luttikhuizen; TBN 5; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 203–17.

[5] On the different explanations of the meaning of the name, see K. Budde, "Die Erklärung des Names Kajin in Gen. 4.1," *ZAW* 31 (1911): 147–57.

with the usual designation of בן "son," nor with any other Hebrew word for a male child, but instead has her call the infant איש, "man." This incongruity, that in other Jewish and Christian interpretations would lead to further speculation on Cain's radiant countenance at the moment of his birth,[6] does not seem to have bothered the targumists particularly, since only the *Targum Neofiti* (henceforth *Neofiti*) felt the need to change it to the more usual בר [written ביר in the margin], which is the Aramaic translation of the Hebrew בן, instead of translating it, as *Targum Onqelos* (henceforth *Onqelos*) does, with גברא.

What most bothered the Aramaic translators was the ambiguity produced by the use of the particle את. In Hebrew, את is very often simply the marker of the verb's object, as found in the same verse: האדם ידע את חוה, "And Adam knew Eve." Which means that if את is so interpreted, Eve's exclamation could be translated "I have acquired a man, YHWH," instead of the usual translation "I have acquired a man from the Lord." That this danger of misunderstanding the Hebrew sentence is not imaginary is proved by the Gnostics' interpretations, such as the one found in the *Apocryphon of John*, which makes Eve the mother of both Eloim and Yave, the two sons begotten on her by the supreme archon Yaldabaoth.[7]

The targumim, of course, tried to dispel this ambiguity by various means. *Onqelos* and *Neofiti* use מן קדם, "from before," to make clear that the Lord cannot be understood in apposition to "a man." In a similar manner, the LXX achieves the same result with the translation of את by διά:

---

[6] Such as *L.A.E.* 21:3 "And she bore a son and he was lustrous. And at once, the infant rose, ran, and brought in his hands a reed and gave it to his mother. And his name was called Cain." (M. D. Johnson, "Life of Adam and Eve," in *OTP*, 2:264); see J. Tromp, "Cain and Abel in the Greek and Armenian/Georgian recensions of the 'Life of Adam and Eve,'" in *Literature on Adam and Eve: Collected Essays* (ed. G. A. Anderson, M. E. Stone, and J. Tromp; SVTP 15; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 277–96. A similar assertion is found in the *Pirqe R. El.* 21: "And she saw his likeness that it was not of the earthly beings, but of the heavenly beings, and she prophesied and said: 'I have gotten a man with the Lord.'" See G. Friedlander, *Pirkê de Rabbi Eliezer* (4th ed.; The Judaic Studies Library; New York: Sepher-Hermon, 1981), 151. J. L. Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998), 157, interprets the text of *Pirqe Rabbi Eliezer* giving to "man" the meaning of "angel": "It is this spectacle that causes her to opine, I guess I have acquired a "man" (that is, an angelic being) from some *angel of* the Lord."

[7] *The Apocryphon of John, Nag Hammadi Codex II*, 24:16–25: "And the chief archon seduced her and he begot in her two sons; the first and the second (are) Eloim and Yave . . . And these he called with the names Cain and Abel with a view to deceive," according to F. Wise's translation in *The Nag Hammadi Library* (ed. J. M. Robinson; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 112. On the complex Gnostic ideas on the origins of Cain and Abel, see G. G. Stroumsa, *Another Seed: Studies in Gnostic Mythology* (NHS 24; Leiden: Brill, 1984), 38–53, and Luttikhuizen, "Gnostic Ideas About Eve's Children."

διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ; and the Vulgata with the use of *per*: *per Dominum*. *Neofiti*, in addition to using מן קדם and translating איש not as גברא, like *Onqelos*, but directly as בר "a son," changing the verb into the passive form יתיהב לי, "there has been given to me," thus obtaining a smooth and safe translation that avoids all risks: "Behold, there has been given to me a son from before the Lord."

But the only surviving manuscript of *Pseudo-Jonathan*, (British Library Aramaic Additional MS 27031) provides us with a completely different translation of the passage, in which Eve's exclamation is missing. Its Aramaic text reads:[8]

ואדם ידע ית חוה איתתיה דהיא מתעברא מין סמאל מלאכא דה'

which can be rendered: "And Adam knew his wife Eve, who had conceived from Samael, the angel of YHWH."[9] The omission of Eve's exclamation from this translation could be a way of solving the problems discussed, of course, but it is most probably a simple scribal error. The *editio princeps* of 1591 by Asher Forins, which was based on a different manuscript, belonging to the Foa family of Reggio and now lost, had a different, and more complete text, with an additional phrase in the first part of the sentence, and with its own rendering of the exclamation. According to Roger Le Déaut,[10] who studied the relationship of the manuscript reproduced in the *editio princeps* with the London manuscript, both have so many common errors that, though representing two separate branches, they must have ultimately derived from the same archetype. We can therefore confidently use the *editio princeps* for our purpose, since the omission of Eve's exclamation in the London manuscript is best explained by homoioteleuton between the twice occurring מלאכא.

The complete Aramaic text reads:

> ואדם ידע ית חוה איתתיה דהיא חמידת למלאכא והיא מתעברא מין סמאל ואעדיאת ויילידת ית קין ואמרת קניתי לגברא ית מלאכא דה'
>
> And Adam knew his wife Eve, who had desired the angel, and she conceived from Samael, the angel of the Lord, and became pregnant and bore Cain; and she said: "I have acquired as man the angel of the Lord."

---

[8] According to the text edited in the *Polyglotta Matritensis, IV: Targum Palestinense in Pentateuchum. L. 1 Genesis* (Madrid: CSIC, 1988), 29.

[9] For the role of Samael see M. Poorthuis, "Eve's Demonic Offspring: A Jewish Motif in German Literature," in Luttikhuizen, *Eve's Children*, 57–74.

[10] R. Le Déaut and J. Robert, *Targum du Pentateuch: Traduction des deux recensions palestiniennes complètes*. Vol. 1: Genèse (SC 245; Paris: Cerf, 1978), 33–34.

The two main points of this interpretation are clearly asserted in both texts: Cain is not the son of Adam; he is the offspring of Samael. But if we look at the Aramaic version carefully, several other interesting interpretative elements come to the fore.

(1) Already at the beginning, through the addition of "who had desired the angel," the meturgeman makes explicit that he has interpreted the verb ידע not as it was in the Hebrew text (that Adam knew Eve—that is, that "Adam had intercourse with Eve"). In spite of having kept the indication of the direct object ית, he has read it as the assertion that Adam knew something about Eve, namely Eve's sexual desire for the angel. The alternative translation of the London manuscript text proposed by Michael Maher in the recent English translation of *Pseudo-Jonathan* is thus perfectly correct, is spite of the fact that in the London manuscript the addition was lost: "And Adam knew that his wife Eve had conceived from Samael, the angel of the Lord."[11] The same interpretation of the verb ידע is explicitly stated in the *Pirke R. El.* 21 when commenting on the beginning of this verse: "Adam came to her, and she conceived Abel, as it is said, "And Adam knew Eve his wife." What is the meaning of "knew"? (He knew) that she had conceived."[12] This idea may also be present in *Neofiti*, because the translator changes the characteristic ידע for חכם, a verb which does not have the sexual connotations of ידע. *Pseudo-Jonathan*'s addition prepares the reader for the explicit assertion of Cain's paternity which follows. It goes without saying that this interpretation of ידע in the phrase "And Adam knew Eve his wife" is not the most usual explanation of this verse in rabbinic tradition. *Genesis Rabbah* (21:9), for example, reads: "When Adam saw that his descendants were fated to be consigned to Gehenna, he refrained from procreation. But when he saw that after twenty-six generations Israel would accept the Torah, he applied himself to producing descendants; hence, 'And Adam knew Eve his wife.'"[13]

(2) The phrase of the *editio princeps* דהיא חמידת למלאכא "who had desired the angel" may be a faint echo of the complex tradition of the sexual character of the first sin we find in later rabbinic haggadah (the serpent aroused the desire of Eve: "When the serpent came unto Eve he

[11] M. Maher, *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis* (ArBib 1B; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992), 31.
[12] Friedlander, *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer*, 151.
[13] H. Freedman, *The Midrash Rabbah. Genesis* (London: Soncino, 1977), 179.

infused filthy lust into her," says *b. ʿAbod. Zar.* 22b; see also *b. Yebam.* 103b, *b. Šabb.* 146a). But it can also allude to the interpretation of Gen 4:1 in *Genesis Rabbah* just mentioned, to the lack of sexual relations between Adam and Eve for 130 years, and to Eve's resultant sexual frustration. We find the idea twice in the same *Genesis Rabbah* (in 20:11 and 24:6):[14]

> For R. Simon said: Throughout the entire one hundred and thirty years during which Adam held aloof from Eve the male demons were made ardent by her and she bore, while the female demons were inflamed by Adam and they bore, as it is written, "If he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, and with the afflictions of the children of man-Adam" (2 Sam 7:14), which means, the children of the first man.[15]

Be that as it may, Eve's phrase expressing her desire for the angel prepares the reader for the main point, the blunt assertion that follows in the targum: that Samael fathered Cain. This child of Eve's is not Adam's son. This assertion is completely explicit, and needs no comment.

Can we trace how the meturgeman arrived at it? Is it eisegesis or exegesis? Is the translator importing a foreign story into the text in order to be able to explain Cain's later fate and his differences with his brother Abel, or is he attempting an exegesis of the Hebrew text, interpreting not only what the biblical text says, but also what the biblical text leaves unsaid? I feel that in this instance both may be true, and for both explanations we can find clues in the targum text itself.

(3) As we will see below, when dealing with the motives for the dispute between Cain and Abel, the ancient interpreters' main problem was to explain Cain's evil conduct and his murderous deed, having been created good by God. The biblical text has at least two different explanations of the presence of evil on earth: Eve and Adam's fall in the Garden of Gen 3, and the story of the fallen angels who lust after the daughters of men of Gen 6, further elaborated in the Enoch tradition. Curiously enough, the only other mention of Samael in the whole of *Pseudo-Jonathan* seems to indicate that the Targum tried to combine both explanations of the origin of evil. The first mention of Samael is clearly linked with the story of the fall in the Garden. In *Pseudo-Jonathan*'s translation of Gen 3:6, Samael, identified as the angel of death, appears in the middle of Eve's dialogue with the serpent: וחמת איתתא ית סמאל מלאך מותא ודחילת, "And the

[14] Ibid., 170 and 203.

[15] See further Poorthuis, "Eve's Demonic Offspring," 58.

woman saw Samael the angel of death and she was afraid." In the translation of Gen 4:1 the same Samael has intercourse with Eve, and, even more telling, the result of this union, Cain, is not only of mixed origin but of mixed nature, human and heavenly. This reveals itself most clearly if we accept the Maher translation of the Aramaic text of the *editio princeps* ("I have acquired a man, the angel of the Lord").[16] But even in my own translation, the assertion of Cain's mixed nature resulting from the union of the heavenly partner and the human mother is clear.[17] Eve's son is "a man," but he is also "an angel of the Lord," as will be the mixed offspring of the fallen angels, the giants of Gen 6.

(4) But it is, in my view, equally clear that the meturgeman may also have arrived at his conclusion by way of exegesis. Not by exegesis of something said in the biblical text, but by exegesis of what is not said in it, of an *omission* in the text. This is a rather common exegetical procedure in rabbinic exegesis.[18] For example, some rabbinic interpreters concluded that Cain and Abel were twin brothers from the fact that the expression "And Adam knew Eve" is not repeated after the birth of Cain in Gen 4:2,[19] while other exegetes concluded from the same omission that both Cain and Abel were born at the moment of the creation of their parents, on the sixth day of the creation.[20] The author of *Pseudo-Jonathan* is also prone to attributing meaning to things not said in the biblical text, although it

[16] Maher, *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan*, 31.

[17] In my translation, the meaning of Eve's exclamation is different from the one proposed by Mahler, since I give due value to the preposition *le-* clearly present in the text of the *editio princeps*, which means that the "angel of the Lord" is the direct object of the verb, preceded as such by ית, namely, קניתי לגברא ית מלאכא דה' means either that Eve had acquired the angel as man (as sexual partner, which would repeat the assertion of the first part of the verse), or that she had acquired the angel as a son. In both cases, the assertion of the mixed nature of Cain, though indirect, is equally clear: he is of angelic origin.

[18] Cf. the observations made by L. M. Teugels, "The Twin Sisters of Cain and Abel: A Survey of the Rabbinic Sources," in Luttikhuizen, *Eve's Children*, 47–56.

[19] The biblical text simply says that "she bore again his brother Abel," without expressly saying that Adam knew Eve and that she conceived. *Gen. Rab.* 22:3 "*And again* (*wa-tosef*) *she bore his brother Abel*" (Gen 4:2). This supports what R. Joshua b. Karhah said: "They ascended the bed two and descended seven, for *and she again bore* implies an additional birth, but not an additional pregnancy." Freedman, *Midrash Rabbah: Genesis*, 181.

[20] This is asserted in *Gen. Rab.* 22:2 as an explanation of the biblical phrase "And she conceived and bore Cain" of Gen 4:1: "R. Eleazar b. Azariah said: Three wonders were performed on that day: on that very day they were created, on that very day they cohabited, and on that very day they produced offspring." In *Gen. Rab.* 24:7 the same explanation is offered as exegesis of the phrase "In the day God created man" of Gen 5:1. Freedman, *Midrash Rabbah: Genesis*, 180 and 204. *Pirqe R. El.* 11, is even more precise, since it determines even the precise hour of the sixth day where everything happened: "The day had twelve hours;

is not always clear which omission is the starting point of his exegesis. Fortunately, in this case the meturgeman makes the point explicit, not in the exegesis of our text, but a little later on, when translating Gen 5:3, the verse which narrates the birth of Seth. There he states that Cain did not resemble Adam and therefore was not his son, thus demonstrating that the absence from the birth of Cain of the expression used for the birth of Seth was an important factor in concluding that he was the son of an angel and not of Adam.[21] In the Hebrew text of Gen 5:3 we read that Adam "begot a son in his own likeness, after his image, and called his name Seth." Since this phrase is absent from Gen 4:1, the meturgeman concluded that Cain, unlike Seth, was not born in Adam's likeness, and was thus not his offspring. *Pseudo-Jonathan*'s Aramaic translation of Gen 5:3 adds the following (here in italics) to the biblical text:

> *When Adam had lived a hundred and thirty years he begot* Seth (the biblical text says *a son*) *who resembled his image and likeness.* For before that, Eve had borne Cain, who was not from him and who did not resemble him. Abel was killed by Cain, and Cain was banished, and his descendants are not recorded in the book of the genealogy of Adam. But afterwards he begot one who resembled him *and he called his name Seth*.

That both eisegesis and exegesis are present in the background of our targumic text can be illustrated with a quote from the *Pirqe R. El.* 21, a text related in several ways to our Targum,[22] where both elements appear together:

> Just as with this garden (the text is talking of Eden) whatever is sown therein, it produces and brings forth, so (with) this woman, what seed she receives, she conceives and bears through sexual intercourse. Riding on the serpent he came to her, and she conceived Cain,[23] as it is said: Adam knew Eve his wife. What is the meaning of "knew"? (He knew) that she had conceived. And she saw his likeness that it was not of the earthly beings, but of the heavenly beings, and she prophesied and said: "I have gotten a man with the Lord."[24]

---

in the first . . . in the ninth (hour) they went up to (their) couch as two and descended as four." Friedlander, *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer*, 77–78.

[21] A similar development can be found in several Gnostic writings, see Stroumsa, *Another Seed*, 49–53.

[22] On the relationship of the *Pirqe Rabbi Eliezer* and *Pseudo-Jonathan*, see M. Pérez Fernández, *Los capítulos de Rabbí Eliezer* (BMidr 1; Valencia: S. Jerónimo, 1984), 31–36, and R. Hayward, "Pirqe de Rabbi Eliezer and Targum Pseudo-Jonathan," *JJS* 42 (1991): 215–46.

[23] In its first edition, Friedlander's translation adds "afterwards Adam came to her, and she conceived Abel" with the Jalkut and the Zohar.

[24] Friedlander, *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer*, 150–51.

The father of Cain in this text remains anonymous. The "he" is the devil, of course, riding on the serpent. Giving the devil a name, Samael, is most probably a late development, since it is only attested to in this Targum,[25] and may also be making a half-caste of Cain. Not completely angel, but certainly not human, a real "bastard" in all senses of the word.

2. Eve's Daughters[26]

The Aramaic translation of the first part of Gen 4:2 in the *Pseudo-Jonathan* contains two interesting additions to the Hebrew text (in italics in the translation):

ואוסופת למילד מן בעלה אדם ית תיומתיה ויתּ הבל

And again *from Adam her husband* she bore *his twin sister and* Abel.

Since Adam had no part in the conception and birth of Cain in *Pseudo-Jonathan*, the meturgeman needs to introduce him anew as an actor, in order to present him as the real father of Abel in the first addition. This addition is thus a direct consequence of his attributing the paternity of Cain to Samael. The second addition is the introduction of Abel's twin sister. According to *Pseudo-Jonathan*, Eve gave birth not only to the two sons mentioned in the biblical text, but also to a daughter.

Apparently, our Targum is simply alluding to a well-know tradition here. Since the Bible is completely silent on the birth of any daughter of Adam and Eve at this early juncture (only later, in Gen 5:4, will she give birth to the anonymous "sons and daughters"), the question of how their earlier sons could have married during the 130 years which had elapsed between their birth and the birth of Seth was unavoidable. *Jubilees* is (as van Ruiten notices)[27] the oldest source that gives Adam and Eve named

[25] The identification of the father of Cain with Samael appears, but only implicitly, in two Nag Hammaadi tractates, since Samael is one of the three names given to the archon who fathered both Cain and Abel. In the already quoted *Apocryphon of John* we find: "Now the archon who is weak has three names. The first name is Yaltabaoth, the second is Saklas, and the third is Samael" (11:18). Similarly, in the *Trimorphic Protennoia* it is said of "the great Demon who rules over the lowest part of the underworld" that "he is called 'Saklas,' that is, 'Samael,' 'Yaltabaoth'" (39:20–25).

[26] See also Teugels, "The Twin Sisters of Cain and Abel."

[27] J. T. A. G. M. van Ruiten, *Primaeval History Interpreted: The Rewriting of Genesis 1–11 in the Book of Jubilees* (JSJSup 66; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 136, n. 42; idem, "Eve's Pain in Childbearing? Interpretations of Gen 3:16a in Biblical and Early Jewish Texts," in Luttikhuizen, *Eve's Children*, 3–26, esp. 15.

daughters (Awan, in 4:1, who will become the wife of Cain in 4:9, and Azura in 4:8, who will become the wife of Seth in 4:11) as a solution to this problem. Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* called this first daughter *Noaba* (1:1), and mentions also further "fillios duodecim et filias octo" (1:2) whose names are detailed as explanations of the "sons and daughters" of Gen 5:4, though the list of names which follows in *L.A.B.* 1:3–4 contains only nine male names (the number of children given by *Jub.* 4:10) and seven female. The question of the names of the sons and daughters is rather complicated; Jacobson[28] has a very detailed account of all variations, but this question need not distract us here, since neither *Pseudo-Jonathan* nor the other Targumim gave a name to the twin sister. What is interesting is precisely this silence on the matter of names. Since *Pseudo-Jonathan* is fond of giving names to the characters he introduces, the omission of the daughter's name is a telling indication, in my view, that the meturgeman in this case is only summarizing a well-known interpretation.

Equally interesting (and traditional) is the exegetical method followed by the targumist in order to insert this tradition into his translation. The Hebrew text has a double את, before "his brother" and before "Abel" (את אחיו את הבל), and this is the peg on which the Aramaic translation is hung: ית תיומתיה ויתּ הבל. Since, to our targumist, Cain and Abel are not full brothers, he cannot afford a literal translation of the Hebrew text and translates the Hebrew "his brother" as תיומתיה "his twin sister." Since the meturgeman has retained the third person masculine pronoun present in the Hebrew word for brother, the resulting sentence is rather ambiguous. In the Aramaic text, the nearest referent for the suffix is "Adam her husband," but obviously, the daughter cannot be a twin sister of his father. James Kugel's translation of the Aramaic phrase[29] takes the referent as Cain, inserting his name between brackets, but no reason is given for this interpretation. Jacobson also understands our targum in the same way,

---

[28] H. Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum: With Latin Text and English Translation* (AGJU 31; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 282–83, discusses the various names of Adam's daughters and suggests that the name could have been Noama, taken over from the attested name of the wife of Tuval-Cain of Gen 4:24. On the names of Eve's daughters see A. Marmorstein, "Die Namen der Schwestern Kains und Abels in der midraschichen und in der apokryphen Literatur," *ZAW* 25 (1905): 141–44, and S. Poznanski, "Zur den Namen der Frauen Kain's and Abel's," *ZAW* 25 (1905): 340–42.

[29] J. L. Kugel, *The Bible As It Was* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1997), 87 and *Traditions of the Bible*, 148: "And she additionally bore from Adam her husband his [Cain's] twin sister and Abel."

and suggests that Noaba may even be Cain's twin sister, but his reasons are not compelling.[30]

It seems more straightforward to me to understand the masculine suffix as proleptic, and to consider the unnamed girl as Abel's twin sister, who is named after her. In fact, considering her as Cain's twin sister seems positively ruled out by the fact that the targumist has asserted in the previous verse that the father of Cain is Samael. For *Pseudo-Jonathan*, Cain and Abel are not full brothers, and the Aramaic word used to designate the girl תיומתא/תיומא, "twin," can only refer to full brothers, such as Esau and Jacob in Gen 25:24, or Peretz and Zerah, the twin sons of Judah and Tamar in Gen 38:27, where the same word is used in the targum.[31] This point is of some significance to the further development of the story, as we will see below.

As described above, the meturgeman's exegetical peg was again the repetition of את in the Hebrew text of Gen 4:2, which indicated for him a double birth. This exploitation of repetition in the biblical text is very common in rabbinical exegesis, and *Gen. Rab.* 22:2 gives us a perfect example, since in this passage the את which appears in Gen 4:1 is also understood as implying that a twin sister was born together with Cain:

> *And she conceived and bore Cain* (4:1). R. Eleazar b. Azariah said: Three wonders were performed on that day: on that very day they were created, on that very day they cohabited, and on that very day they produced offspring. R. Joshua b. Karhah said: Only two entered the bed, and seven left it: Cain and his twin sister, Abel and his two twin sisters.[32]

---

[30] "Though one might understand otherwise, it appears that Targ. Jon (supra) offers a rendition that only gives a twin to Cain. This of course makes sense, not merely because strictly speaking it is only the first-born who needs a female sibling in order to propagate, but also because, since Abel will have no children, the need for the introduction of a sibling/wife is reduced" (*A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, 283). But these arguments overlook the fact that many other texts explicitly assign siblings to both brothers. His argument to consider Noaba as a twin sister of Cain is solely based on the order in which the names appeared in *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*. Having noted that *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, after having said that Adam and Eve had *tres filios et una filiam*, mentions Noaba in second place and not last as expected, Jacobson concludes: "This likely means that Noaba is in her proper chronological order, born after Cain, and perhaps even Cain's twin." Ibid.

[31] These are the only occurrences of the word in *Pseudo-Jonathan*, according to E. G. Clarke, *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan of the Pentateuch: Text and Concordance* (Hoboken, N.J.: Ktav, 1984), 600.

[32] Freedman, *Midrash Rabbah: Genesis*, 180; see also the dicussion by Teugels, "The Twin Sisters of Cain and Abel," 48–49.

Cain having only one twin sister while Abel has two is the direct conclusion of the use of one את in 4:1 and of two את in 4:2. Joshua b. Karhah (as is stated in *Gen. Rab.* 22:3) interpreted the *wa-tosef* ("and again") of the biblical text as referring to "an additional birth, but not to an additional pregnancy," implying that Abel and Cain were conceived simultaneously and were, thus, twin brothers, as is stated explicitly by Rabbi Joseph in *Pirqe R. El.* 21.[33] Hence, the seven leaving the bed in *Genesis Rabbah.* To our targumist, "and again" is a completely new pregnancy with a different father, this time Adam, and therefore his conclusion is that only four left the bed at that instance (Adam, Eve, Abel and his sister). The exegetical procedure followed is identical in all these cases.

This solution to the problem of Cain and Abel's marriages presented fundamental problems to the Rabbis in light of the prohibition of incestuous unions in Lev 20:17.[34] This does not seem to have bothered our meturgeman particularly in this case, which is rather strange since, in the translation of Lev 20:17, both *Neofiti* and *Pseudo-Jonathan* add a gloss in which the first humans are explicitly exempted from the prohibition of incest in order to fill the world.[35] In our text, instead, the translator simply ignores the necessarily incestuous character of the relationship. But the

---

[33] Friedlander, *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer*, 152: "Rabbi Joseph said: Cain and Abel were twins, as it is said, 'And she conceived, and bore (with) Cain'" (Gen 4:1). At that hour she had additional capacity for child-bearing (as it is said), "'And she *continued* to bear his brother Abel.'" The same conclusion is already stated in *Pirqe R. El.* 11: "At the ninth (hour) they went up to (their) couch as two and descended as four." Friedlander, *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer*, 78.

[34] Friedlander, *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer*, 152: "Rabbi Miasha said: Cain was born, and his wife, his twin sister, with him. (The Oxford MS adds: Abel was born, and with him his twin sister). Rabbi Simeon said to him: Has it not already been said, 'And if a man shall take his sister, his father's daughter, or his mother's daughter, and see her nakedness, and she see his nakedness; it is a shameful thing?' (Lev 20:17) From these words know that there were no other women whom they could marry, and these were permitted to them, as it is said, 'For I have said, The world shall be built up by love'" (Ps 89:2).

[35] *Tg. Neof. Lev.* 20:17 reads "And any man who takes (as wife) his sister, his father's daughter, or his mother's daughter, and sees her nakedness, and she sees his nakedness, this was a favour I did the first (men) for the building of the world. But since them, all who do so shall be blotted out before the eyes of the children of their people. He has dishonoured the nakedness of his sister; he shall receive (the punishment of) his sin." *Pseudo-Jonathan* is even more precise, giving a double translation of חסד and introducing a reference to the giving of the Law: "And any man who has a sexual relation with his sister, his father's daughter or his mother's daughter and he despise her nakedness, and she despise his nakedness, it is a shameful thing; because I did a favour to the first men so that the world would be fill with them before the law was given; but after the law has been given to the world, all who do so shall be exterminated by a plague and the children of their people shall see his punishment. Since he has despised the nakedness of his sister, he will receive (the punishment of) his own sin."

daughter (or daughters) of Eve will play an important role in some of the texts which deal with the motives for the dispute between Cain and Abel, the third point of this paper.

3. The Dispute between Cain and Abel

The biblical text of Gen 4:8 says: "Cain said to Abel," but fails to record what Cain actually said to his brother. All the old versions fill in this omission, of course.[36] However, since the biblical text also fails to explain why Abel's offer was more acceptable to God than Cain's offer, it is not surprising that the Palestinian Targumim insert at this point a theological debate between the brothers in which this omission is clarified and in which Cain's mistaken theological opinions are explained. The conclusion of the debate is the death of Abel, and the Targumim suggest that Cain killed Abel because of their differing theological opinions, thus exculpating the Almighty of all possible blame. Some scholars see in the debate a reflection of the theological disputes between different schools at a particular moment (a polemic against those who believed there were two powers in heaven, an attack against the Epicureans, against the Sadducees' and Pharisees' disputes on the world to come, and so on) while other scholars believe that the different targumic versions represent different polemic situations in different epochs. This theological debate, concentrated on targumic glosses to Gen 4:7–8, has been studied so intensely that there is no point in researching it again here.[37] I will only underline that it has

[36] LXX: Διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πεδίον "Let us go out into the plain"; Vulgata: *egrediamur foras* "let us go out outside"; *Tg. Neofiti*: איתה ונפק תרינן לאפי ברא "Come, let the two of us go out into the open field"; *Tg. Ps.-J.*: איתה תיפוק תרוינן לברא "Come, let the two of us go out to the field."

[37] Among the most important studies on the passage, see P. Grelot, "Les targums du Pentateuque: Etude comparative d'après Genèse IV, 3–16," *Sem* 9 (1959): 59–88; R. Le Déaut, "Traditions targumiques dans le corpus paulinien?" *Bib* 42 (1961): 28–48; G. Vermes, "The Targumic Versions of Genesis IV 3–16," *ALUOS* 3 (1961–62) [1963]: 81–114, repr. in *Post-Biblical Jewish Studies* (SJLA 8; Leiden: Brill, 1975), 82–126; M. McNamara, *The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch* (AnBib 27; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1966), 155–60; J. Bowker, *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature*: *An Introduction to Jewish Interpretations of Scripture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), 32–140; S. Issenberg, "An Anti-Sadducee Polemic in the Palestinian Targum Tradition," *HTR* 63 (1970): 433–44; G. J. Kuiper, "Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: A Study of Genesis 4:7–10:16," *Aug* 10 (1970): 533–70; E. Levine, "The Syriac Version of Gen. IV 1–6," *VT* 26 (1976): 70–80; B. Chilton, "A Comparative Study of Synoptic Development: The Dispute between Cain and Abel in the Palestinian Targums and the Beelzebub Controversy in the Gospels," *JBL* 101 (1982): 553–62; J. M. Bassler, "Cain and Abel in the Palestinian Targums: A Brief Note on

considerably helped the transformation of Cain and Abel respectively into symbols of good and evil, righteousness and wickedness. The different textual witnesses each accent a different element: *Neofiti* emphasizes Abel's righteous deeds; the Epistle to the Hebrews, his faith; *Pseudo-Jonathan*, his mercy. For other witnesses, such as the Leningrad Manuscript,[38] the partiality is the central topic; for *Onqelos*, that Cain can be forgiven; for other texts, that justice and just reward will come in the future world, etc. All of these interpretations contribute to the mythologizing of this first crime in human history, transforming it into a symbol of the perennial conflict between good and evil, a development already anticipated in *Pseudo-Jonathan* by ascribing Cain's paternity to Samael.

But not all rabbinic traditions focus on these high theological problems. Sometimes, more earthly reasons are given as explanation for the brothers' dispute. *Pirke R. El.* 21 reads:

> Rabbi Zadok said: A great hatred entered Cain's heart against his brother Abel, because his offering had been accepted. Not only (on this account), but also because Abel's twin-sister was the most beautiful of women, and he desired her in his heart. Moreover he said: I will slay Abel my brother, and I will take his twin-sister from him, as it is said, "And it came to pass when they were in the field" (Gen 4:8). "In the field" means woman, who is compared to a field.[39]

In this text, Cain's desire for Abel's twin sister is brought to the fore in conjunction with the only possible biblical motive for the hatred between the brothers (Cain's offerings not being accepted by God). It is clear that in the opinion of Rabbi Zadok, only one woman was available for the two brothers, and this was what provoked the dispute and its fatal end: the first human crime was the result of a fight for a woman. The exegetical peg used to bring this motive into the text is rather contrived and far fetched in this case, but by introducing this motive, R. Zaddok avoid the pitfalls of theological discussions and excludes divine responsibility for this first murder, making it a very human affair. Perhaps for this reason, the same

---

an Old Controversy," *JSJ* 17 (1986): 56–64. M. L. Klein, *Genizah Manuscripts of Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1986), published for the first time two new tosefta fragments of the dispute: J.T.S. 605 (ENA 2578), f. 26b (pp. 10–11, pl. 101) and C.U.L. T-S NS 184.81r (pp. 10–11, pl. 154), but they do not add anything substantial to the other witnesses.

[38] The manuscript Leningrad Antonin 739, published by P. Kahle, *Masoreten des Westens* II (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1930), 6–7.

[39] Friedlander, *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer*, 154; cf. also Teugels, "The Twin Sisters of Cain and Abel," 56.

explanation is found in several other texts. In *Gen. Rab.* 22:7 it comes in two different forms: as a quarrel to possess the first Eve,[40] and as a quarrel to possess the only daughter of Adam and Eve.[41]

> *And Cain spoke unto Abel his brother, etc.* (Gen 4:8). About what did they quarrel? "Come," said they, "let us divide the world." One took the land and the other the movables. The former said, "The land you stand on is mine," while the latter retorted, "What you are wearing is mine." One said: "Strip"; the other retorted: "Fly [off the ground]." Out of this quarrel, *Cain rose up against his brother Abel, etc.* R. Joshua of Siknin said in R. Levi's name: Both took land and both took movables, but about what did they quarrel? One said, "The Temple must be built in my area," while the other claimed, "It must be built in mine." For thus it is written, *And it came to pass, when they were in the field*. Now "field" refers to nought but the Temple, as you read, *Zion* [*i.e. the Temple*] *shall be plowed as a field* (Mic 3:12). Out of this argument, *Cain rose up against his brother Abel, etc.* Judah b. Rabbi said: Their quarrel was about the first Eve. Said R. Aibu: The first Eve had returned to dust. Then about what was their quarrel? Said R. Huna: An additional twin was born with Abel, and each claimed her. The one claimed: "I will have her, because I am the firstborn"; while the other maintained: "I must have her, because she was born with me."[42]

The spectrum of motives presented in this text is more diversified, and the authorities disagree fundamentally among them. The first argument reflects the quarrel between farmers and herdsmen (Cain was a "tiller of the land" and Abel a "keeper of the sheep" according to the biblical text), and the division of possessions between the two sons. R. Levi denies that one brother had taken all the land and the other all the movables, and since they divided both among themselves there should have been no economic grounds for quarrel. R. Aibu denies that the first Eve was still alive, excluding this shadowy figure as a motive. There remains,

---

[40] Understood either as Lilith, Adam's first wife according to some traditions, or as Eve in the process of being created, whose sight made Adam flee, according to the interpretation of Gen 2:23 found in *Gen. Rab.* 18:4: "*And the man said: This is now* (*zoth ha-paʿam*) etc. R. Juda b. Rabbi said: At first He created her for him and he saw her full of discharge and blood; thereupon He removed her from him and recreated her a second time. Hence he said: *This time she is bone of my bone.*" (Freedman, *Midrash Rabbah: Genesis*, 142). The tradition of the two Eves is exegetically grounded on the expression used in the biblical text: זאת הפעם, understood as "this time" and implying consequently that the other time the Eve created by God was not the same as this one.

[41] In these two texts, the fight occurs in a three person context, but as we shall see, this motive appears even within traditions with a four persons context, in which two women are available for the two brothers.

[42] Freedman, *Midrash Rabbah: Genesis*, 187; the last part of this text is also quoted by Teugels, "The Twin Sisters of Cain and Abel," 53.

therefore, as sole motive the right of ownership of the future temple and Abel's unnamed twin sister. God is totally absent, and the acceptance or refusal of the brothers' offerings is kept totally silent.

In Klein's edition of the *Geniza Manuscripts of Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch*, there is a series of *toseftot*[43] which give a more developed version of the discussion.[44] It seems fitting to close with this text, because there the protagonists are not only Cain and Abel but also their twin sisters.[45]

The first seven lines of the recto of the manuscript (Oxford Bodleian Ms. Beb. c 74), after quoting the opening of Gen 4:8, "And Cain said," combine elements known from the other targumic disputes, both over justice and retribution and over the two brothers' offerings, which result in the death of Abel. In line 7 a new *tosefta* begins with a quotation from Gen 4:7, but almost directly reverts to the dispute between Cain and Abel, summarizing the second part of the classical dispute on retribution and the future world:

> Cain answered and said to his brother Abel: There is neither Justice nor Judge, nor is there any world besides this one. Abel answered him [and said:] There is Jus[tice, and there is] a Judge, and there is another world, for the requiting of the evil and the good. (lines 7–8)

But instead of finishing the dispute with the murder of Abel, such as in *Neofiti* or *Pseudo-Jonathan* ("Cain rose up against Abel his brother and drove a stone into his forehead and killed him"), this *tosefta* continues with a text which retells in great detail the division of the possessions between the two brothers, recalling the already quoted text of *Gen. Rab*. 22:7:

---

[43] A *tosefta* is an expansive passage of aggadic midrash which has its source in the Palestinian Targum tradition, but has been preserved either in separate collections of *toseftot* under the title "Tosefta" or "additional Targum," or has been inserted into *Onqelos* manuscripts at the biblically correct point.

[44] The *tosefta* was already partially published by M. Ginsburger, *Das Fragmententhargum* (Berlin: Calvary, 1899), 71–72 and was also partially transcribed in M. L. Klein, "Targumic Toseftot from the Cairo Genizah," in *Salvación en la Palabra. Targum—Derash—Berith: En memoria del profesor Alejandro Díez Macho* (ed. D. Muñoz León; Madrid: Cristiandad, 1986), 409–18, at 414–15, n. 14. Klein, *Genizah Manuscripts of Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch*, 10–15, pls. 118–19 provides the full edition of the manuscript, Oxford Bodleian Heb c 74.

[45] The text is quoted in the translation of Klein, *Genizah Manuscripts of Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch*, 11.

> At that moment [Cain] considered what he might do to him, but found nothing [suitable]. Afterwards his wrath subsided, and he said to Abel: Now, let there not b[e a quarrel] between me and you; separate from me and take the flock as your lot. Said Abel to him: [All that] I desire is a f[air] division. [After] Abel had gone to his sheep and departed from Cain, Cain thought it over and said: What have I done? The summer [month] will pa[ss], and [I] will have no milk to drink and no wool to wear. He began to pursue him, and he overtook him, and said [to him: This is not] a fair division. You take half of the flock and half of the land; and I will take half of the flock and ha[lf] of the land. Said Abel to him: Do as you please. [And] they made the division at that moment. Abel said to him: This is an equal division which is done in fairness; [and] Abel went on his way. Cain [then] tried to graze his portion of the she[ep], but found he was unable to graze sheep, and [thereby] neglect working the land. He [then] went to Abel, and said: There is another fairer [division] than this; you take the flock as your lot and I shall take the land as my lot. Abel agreed to go along with Cain's desire. (lines 9–18)

The story has now arrived back at the first point. Abel went along with every one of Cain's proposals: the three tentative divisions of the common possessions, land and flock, are not presented as alternatives (as in *Genesis Rabbah*) but as successive proposals from Cain to which Abel agreed in any case. The matter seems resolved in a satisfactory way for everybody. However, the text goes further and brings up an old grudge of Cain's against Abel:

> Now, Cain had been bearing a grudge against Abel from before this, because Abel's [twin] sister was Cain's wife, and she was not as good looking as Cain's [twin] sister who was Abel's wife. When Cain recalled what was in his heart, he said: Now I have fou[nd] an opportunity for my hatred (?). He ran after him, and sai[d] to him: Get off my land, which I have taken as my lot. Abel could not find any place to go to. (lines 18–21)

The real motive, therefore, for Cain's hatred was not a theological dispute, nor even the deception, because his sacrifices were not agreeable to God, as in the biblical text, but the "old grudge," the jealousy for the beauty of his brother's wife, his own twin sister. The author of the *tosefta* believes that each brother has his own twin sister and in order to minimize the incest, he makes each brother marry the twin sister of the other. There should be no need for a quarrel, since each brother has his own wife. But the beauty of Eve's daughters is the core of the matter, as in Gen 6:2. Like a writer of modern detective fiction, the author of the *tosefta* "cherche la femme" in order to uncover the source of the conflict. By using the very earthly motive of coveting his brother's wife as the source of Cain's hatred

for Abel, he is able to avoid all the theological pitfalls associated with why the offerings of one were accepted and not the sacrifices of the other. Besides, the author is a good writer, who, with a keen sense of drama, partially reverses the roles of the biblical characters. In the biblical text the curse of Cain is, "a fugitive and a vagabond shall you be on the earth" (Gen 4:12 and 14); by casting Abel now, the future victim, in the role of one who "could not find any place to go," he prepares the reader for the coming punishment. But, for the moment, we have an Abel errant, yet very much alive; his death is still to come. However, since Cain's crime is supposed to be the first death on earth, he cannot describe him as already expert in killing. He could have made recourse to the stone of the Targumim, but its use would also need to be explained. The author was ingenious enough to also find an original solution to this problem:

> And he (Cain) did not know where to strike him. He looked about here and there, until he saw two birds fighting; and one rose up against the other, and struck it on its mouth, and its blood spurted out until it died. Cain took a lesson from it, and did the same to Abel [his] brother. Then seeing that he was dead, he feared that his father would demand [Abel] from him; and he did not know what to do. Looking up, he saw the bird that had killed its fellow putting its mouth to the ground; and it dug [a hole], and buried the other dead one, and covered it with earth. At that moment, Cain did the same to Abel, so that [his father] might not find him. (lines 21–26)

The drama is closed, but in a minor tone. The figure of Cain that comes out of this Aramaic *tosefta* is quite different from the one we have gleaned from *Pseudo-Jonathan*. Cain is no son of the devil, nor a personification of evil itself. He comes across from the narrative as a clumsy character, more stupid than really bad, one who does not really know what he wants, nor how to proceed once he has decided to let his old hatred guide his actions. He is, like Abel and the two twin sisters, simply a child of Eve.

CHAPTER EIGHT

SODOM AND GOMORRAH IN THE TARGUMIM

Introduction

Despite its general title, my paper shall not attempt to describe the story of the two cities as retold in the Targumim. It will simply try to illuminate some differences encountered in the Aramaic translations of the biblical narrative about Sodom and Gomorrah, in the hope of showing how the biblical text was developed and transformed in the Aramaic translations. This paper will thus have the character of a collection of miniatures, small vignettes, each dealing with a different verse of the biblical narrative. It can be seen as a small triptych, with each panel depicting Gen 18:1, Gen 18:20 and Gen 18:21 respectively. But more than just portraying three stories, each panel will attempt to answer one of the following questions: (1) Who destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah? (2) What were the sins of Sodom? (3) Who was Pelitit?

1. Who Destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah?

The Masoretic text of Gen 18:1 starts directly with the apparition of God to Abraham. The text states straightforwardly: "And YHWH appeared to him by the oaks of Mamre, as he sat in the tent door in the heat of the day" (Gen 18:1). But in the following verse (Gen 18:2) what Abraham sees are "three men (שלשה אנשים), and he ran to meet them (in plural, לקראתם)." In Gen 18:3 Abraham addresses himself to a single person: "If I have found grace in your eyes (singular pronoun, בעיניך), do not pass away (singular verb, תעבר)," but in 18:4 he requests that they wash (plural verb, ורחצו) their feet (plural pronoun, רגליהם). The same alternation of singular and plural forms is found in other consecutive verses of the same chapter. For example, in verse 9 the three men address Abraham: "and they said to him" (ויאמרו), but in verse 10 it is apparently God who addresses Abraham announcing that he will return and Sarah will have a son: "and he said" (ויאמר). Genesis 18:22 solves this ambiguity by making clear that there are four protagonists in view, God and the three men: "And the (three) men turned their faces from there and went to Sodom, but Abraham stood yet before YHWH."

The Hebrew text thus presents a number of problems and it leaves many things unexplained.[1] When precisely did the apparition take place? The Hebrew text narrates the apparition to Abraham directly after his reference to his circumcision, but without establishing any temporal link between the two narratives, thus leaving this fundamental meeting without a precise timeframe. Why was Abraham sitting out in the heat of the day? Was he lazy and preferred to sit instead of working? Or was he slightly out of his mind, to do such a thing instead of sitting in the shade? Even more importantly, who were these three men who, in the narrative, sometimes seem to be confused with God himself?

The Aramaic translations have a ready answer to all these obvious questions, of course, and to many more, some of them rather unexpected.

The Aramaic translation of Gen 18:1 in *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* reads:[2]

> ואתגלי עלוהי יקרא דה' בחיזוי ממרא והוא מרע מכיבא דמהולתא יתיב תרע משכנא לתוקפא דיומא
>
> And it was revealed upon him the glory of the Lord in the vision of Mamre when, sick from the pain of the circumcision, he was sitting at the door of the tent in the strength of the day.

The answer as to why Abraham was sitting at that time of day is clear: Abraham was sick from the pain of the circumcision and consequently was unable to work. *Pseudo-Jonathan* is less clear concerning the timeframe because it simply uses a nominal sentence (והוא, "and he was," which I have translated by "when"), but it clearly links the narrative with the previous narrative of Gen 17 and implies that both stories follow each other closely. That God does not appear directly to Abraham, but rather יקרא דה' "the glory of YHWH" is revealed to him, was to be expected, since the targumim avoid anthropomorphism. However, the transformation of באלני ממרא, "in the oaks of Mamre," into בחיזוי ממרא is more difficult to explain, though it is the usual translation in *Pseudo-Jonathan*

---

[1] Among the many studies dedicated to the problems of the biblical text, see, for example, W. W. Fields, *Sodom and Gomorrah: History and Motif in Biblical Narrative* (JSOTSup 231; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997); R. I. Letellier, *Day in Mamre, Night in Sodom: Abraham and Lot in Gen. 18 and 19* (BIS 10; Leiden: Brill, 1995); J. A. Loader, *A Tale of Two Cities: Sodom and Gomorrah in the Old Testament, Early Jewish and Early Christian Traditions* (CBET 1; Kok: Kampen, 1990); T. Rudin-O'Brasky, *The Patriarch in Hebron and Sodom: A Study of the Structure and Composition of a Biblical Story* (Jerusalem: Simor, 1982) [Hebrew].

[2] According to the text edited in the *Polyglotta Matritensis*, IV: Targum Palestinense in Pentateuchum. L. 1 Genesis (Madrid: CSIC, 1988), 109.

of the Hebrew phrase (Gen 13:18; 14:13, etc.). בחיזוי ממרא can also be translated as "in the crossroad of Mamre,"[3] which would change the locative reference (at the crossroad instead of by the oaks). I prefer to translate it as "the vision," which is the first meaning of the Aramaic word in any case, because *Targum Neofiti* omits, in this instance, any reference to Mamre and translates it as "the Valley of the Vision."[4] To me, this seems to imply that the apparition to Abraham had become the designation of the site itself in the Palestinian targumic tradition.

The answer as to when precisely the apparition took place is most clearly answered by one Fragment Targum, the MS 110 in the Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris.[5] After quoting the beginning of Gen 18:1 in Hebrew, the manuscript continues: "At the time (בזימנא) when Abraham circumcised the flesh of his foreskin three angels were sent to him," leaving no doubt as to when the apparition happened, namely, the very same day of Abraham's circumcision.[6]

The targumim also left no doubts as to the nature of the three "men" of the biblical text. As expected, they are identified as angels, an identification most probably prompted by the biblical text itself, which (in Gen 18:22) asserts that the "men" went towards Sodom and that "two angels" came to Sodom in the evening (on Gen 19:1).[7] Neither *Neofiti* nor MS 440 open the verse with a time reference but rather with the assertion that the three men were angels: "Three angels (תלתא מלאכין) were sent to our father Abraham at the time he circumcised the flesh of his foreskin."[8]

---

[3] "Crossroad" is other possible meaning of the word חיזוי used in the Targum (see Jastrow, 442 s.v. חזוי).

[4] *Neofiti* translates "the oaks of Mamre" with במישריה חזוי די בחברון, "the plain of the vision of Hebron," in Gen 13:18, and with במישרי חזוה דממרא, "the plain of the vision of Mamre," in Gen 14:13, but here only with במשרי חזוי, "the plain of the vision." The same reading is found in MS 110 במישרי חיזווה. The reading of MS 440 במישרי חזוזא, could be considered as a scribal error (confusion of *waw* and *zayin*) and identical with the others, or could be translated as a geographical name: "the plain of Hazoza."

[5] According to the text edited in the *Polyglotta Matritensis*, 108.

[6] The Talmud (*b. B. Meṣi'a* 86b) is even more precise: God appears to Abraham on the third day after his circumcision exactly.

[7] One of the manuscripts from Qumran Cave 4, 4Q180, makes the same identification explicit. In frg. 2 ii 3–4 it is flatly asserted: "The three men [who] appear[ed to Abraha]m at the oak of Mamre are angels." Cf. *DSSSE*, 372–73, and the contribution by E. J. C. Tigchelaar, "Sodom and Gomorrah in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Sodom's Sin: Genesis 18–19 and its Interpretations* (ed. E. Noort and E. J. C. Tigchelaar; TBN 7; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 47–62, esp. 52–57.

[8] *Genesis Rabbah* 50:2 explains the reason for calling them both angels and men: "[*And the two angels came to Sodom.*] Here you call them angels, whereas earlier they were

All this is interesting, but without an apparent link to the story of Sodom and Gomorrah, and consequently of no help in answering the question of who destroyed Sodom. Nevertheless, it helps us understand the following text, in which both the link and the answer are provided. The Aramaic translation of Gen 18:1 in the *Targum Neofiti* needs to be quoted in full.[9]

> תלתא מלאכין אש[ת]לחו לוות אבונן אברהם בזימנא די גזר ית בשר ערלתה ותלתיהו[ן] אשתלחו לתלת מילין ארום לית אפשר לחד ממלאכי מרומא די ישתלח בידה יתיר מן חדה מילה מלאכא קדמאה ישתלח למבשרא לאבונן אברהם די שרה ילדה לה ית יצחק ומלאכה תניינה אשתלח למשיזבה ללוט מגו הפכתא ומלאכה תליתאה אשתלח למיפך סדם ועמורה אדמה וצבויים ואתגלי ממרי[ה] דיי על אברהם במשרי חזוה והוא יתיב בתרע משכניה בתקפה דיומא מתחמם מן אדם גזירתיה במיח[ם] יומא:
>
> Three angels were sent to our father Abraham at the time he circumcised the flesh of his foreskin. The three were sent for three things, because it is impossible for any angel from on high to be sent for more than one thing. The first angel was sent to announce to our father Abraham that Sarah would bear him Isaac; and the second angel was sent to deliver Lot from the destruction; and the third angel was sent to destroy Sodom and Gomorrah, Admah and Zeboiim. And the Word of the Lord was revealed to Abraham in the Valley of the Vision as he was sitting at the door of his tent in the strength of the day, warming himself because of the blood of his circumcision in the heat of the day.[10]

Neofiti is more precise here than *Pseudo-Jonathan*. Since *Neofiti* already specified at the very beginning the "when" of the story, at the end it can explain more clearly "why" Abraham was sitting: Abraham needed to warm himself because he was bleeding after a circumcision done when he was ninety-nine years old. *Neofiti* consistently uses the *Memra d-YHWH*, "the Word of YHWH," instead of the *Yiqara d-YHWH*, "the Glory of YHWH," preferred by *Pseudo-Jonathan*, as an intermediary figure in order to emphasise

---

termed men? Earlier, when the Shechinah was above them, they were men; but as soon as the Shechinah departed from them they assumed the form of angels. R. Levi said: To Abraham, whose [religious] strength was great, they looked like men; but to Lot they appeared as angels, because his strength was feeble. R. Hunia said: Before they performed their mission they were called men; having performed their mission, they assumed the style of angels. R. Tanhuma said: They may be likened to a man who received a governorship from the king. Before he reaches the seat of his authority, he goes like an ordinary citizen. Similarly, before they performed their mission, they are called men; having performed it, they assumed the style of angels." English translation by H. Freedman, *The Midrash Rabbah: Genesis* (London: Soncino, 1977), 435.

[9] According to the edition by A. Díez Macho, *Neophyti 1: Tomo 1: Génesis* (TECC 7; Madrid: CSIC, 1968), 95.

[10] English translation by M. McNamara in A. Díez Macho, *Neofyti 1. 1.*, 538.

the divine distance from the creatures, and, as already said, it does not mention Mamre at all, locating the "where" of the action in the Valley of the Vision. For the rest, the general tenor of this translation of Gen 18:1 is very similar to the one found in the other Palestinian targumim.[11] The surprising element is *Neofiti*'s long preamble before the actual translation of Gen 18:1, with the explanation that the three "men" were indeed three angels with their peculiar individual functions explained on the basis of the principle that no angel can be sent to earth for two different tasks.

This midrashic expansion is not exclusive to *Neofiti*. With a few customary variants, we also find it in the Vatican Ms 440 and in MS 110 (two manuscripts of the Fragment Targum) in Gen 18:1. *Pseudo-Jonathan* does not have it in Gen 18:1 but does include it in the translation of Gen 18:2, although there, only Sodom and Gomorrah (and not the four cities of the plain) are mentioned,[12] and it is specified that the only angels who cannot be sent for two things are the angels דשירותא, "of the service," i.e., the ministering angels. *Pseudo-Jonathan* is also explicit on the matter of these three angels being תלתא מלאכין בדמות גוברין, "three angels in the form of men," a detail missing in *Neofiti* in Gen 18:1 but appearing in *Neofiti*'s translation of Gen 18:2.

This midrashic expansion of *Neofiti* clearly answers our question: the destruction of Sodom was realised by one of the three angels. The mention of the four cities which form the limits of Canaan in Gen 10:19 and which are the cities against which the four Kings of the North wage war in Gen 14:2, 8, is rather surprising because in the biblical narrative the destruction is explicitly restricted to Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen 19:24). This extension of the destruction to the other cities of the plain in *Neofiti* may have been prompted by the more general expression of destruction found in Gen 19:29: "when God destroyed the cities of the plain," which could be interpreted as "all the cities" except Zoar, preserved on account of the request of Lot (Gen 19:19–23). Or it may have been prompted by the reference to the destruction of Admah and Zeboiim in Hos 11:8. But I think it more likely that the targumist is aligning the Genesis text here with the text of Deuteronomy, where the destruction is explicitly extended to the four cities of the plain:

[11] Except for one marginal gloss in *Neofiti* after the Valley of the Vision, which reads: "because of this, there was a word of prophecy from before the Lord unto Abraham the just saying . . . And he (was sitting)."

[12] Curiously, the same midrash is also repeated in the margin of *Neofiti*'s translation of Gen 18:2, and there only Sodom is mentioned.

> And that the whole land is brimstone, and salt, and burning, that it is not sown, nor bears, nor any grass grows on it, like the overthrow of Sodom, and Gomorrah, Admah, and Zeboim, which the Lord overthrew in his anger, and in his wrath. (Deut 29:22)

Neofiti, and all other Palestinian targumim quoted, specify that the angel sent to destroy Sodom and Gomorrah was the third one, but they do not give a name to this angel. In order to find out his name we need to cast our net wider and take a look at the rabbinic traditions on the cities' destruction.[13]

Pirqe R. El. 25,[14] which also specifies the functions of the angels and contains many aggadoth on the destruction of the cities, does not give us the name of the angel sent to destroy the city. Neither do the loci classici on Sodom in the Babylonian Talmud (*b. Sanh.* 54b and 109a–b). But in *b. Baba Meṣi'a* we find the specific identification; the angel was Gabriel:

> Who were the three men?—Michael, Gabriel, and Raphael. Michael came to bring the tidings to Sarah [of Isaac's birth]; Raphael, to heal Abraham; and Gabriel, to overturn Sodom. But is it not written, And there came the two angels to Sodom at even?—Michael accompanied him to rescue Lot. [The Writ] supports this too, for it is written, And he overthrew those cities, not, and they overthrew: this proves it. (*b. B. Meṣi'a* 86b)[15]

The identification of the angel with Gabriel is clear in this text, but the details of the tradition are a little muddled. The second angel, Raphael, true to his name's etymology, is sent to heal Abraham, not to deliver Lot, as was the case in the targum, which implies that two of the angels remained with Abraham while the other one went to fulfil his mission. Hence the question derived from the clear assertion of Gen 19:1. This solution is a little clumsy, however, as having Michael go with Gabriel and giving him the new mission of rescuing Lot clearly goes against the principle that one angel cannot perform two missions. But, at least, it makes clear that Michael's new mission had nothing to do with the destruction of Sodom and was only concerned with rescuing Lot; thus the principle that two

---

[13] For a discussion of the topic in mediaeval Jewish commentaries, see Y. Rachaman, "The Story of Sodom and Gomorrah in the Light of Selected Jewish Commentaries," in *The Bible in the Light of Its Interpreters: Sarah Kamin Memorial Volume* (ed. S. Japhet; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1994), 463–84.

[14] G. Friedlander, *Pirkê de Rabbi Eliezer* (4th ed.; The Judaic Studies Library; New York: Sepher-Hermon, 1981), 179–86.

[15] English translation by H. Freedman, in S. Daiches, H. Freedman, and I. Epstein, *Hebrew-English Edition of the Babylonian Talmud: Baba Mezi'a* (London: Soncino, 1962), loc. cit.

angels cannot perform one single mission is preserved. Scriptural proof is found in the use of the singular in Gen 19:25: "He overthrew those cities." Therefore it was Gabriel, and not "they," Gabriel and Michael.

The same identification can also be found in the biggest repository of rabbinic haggadah, *Genesis Rabbah*:

> Then the two angels came, etc. But He is at one with Himself, and who can turn Him? and what His soul desireth, even that He doeth (Job 23:13). It was taught: One angel does not perform two missions, nor do two angels together perform one mission, yet you read that two [angels came to Sodom]? The fact is, however, that Michael announced his tidings [to Abraham] and departed: Gabriel was sent to overturn Sodom, and Rafael to rescue Lot; hence, Then the two angels came, etc. It is written, He sent forth upon them the fierceness of His anger, Wrath, Indignation, and Trouble, a sending of messengers of evil (Ps 78:49); yet you say, Two [Angels]! But the fact is that Michael announced his tidings and departed; Gabriel was sent to overturn Sodom, and Rafael to save Lot. Hence, Then the two angels came. (*Gen. Rab.* 51:2)[16]

In the commentary of the biblical narrative, which proceeds verse by verse, this passage presents two objections which can be made to the expression used in Gen 19:1 on the basis of a principle quoted by *Neofiti* and put forward in *b. B. Meṣi'a* 86b. The core of the first one is that only one angel should go to Sodom, based on the והוא באחד of the biblical verse quoted (Job 23:13). The answer is that Gabriel's and Rafael's missions were two different missions, and therefore two angels were needed. The second objection, that three angels should have to go to Sodom and not two, because the three expressions of God's anger "cast upon them," which are mentioned in Ps 78:49, are understood as three angels, is answered in the same way.

If the writer of *Genesis Rabbah* had read the targum *Pseudo-Jonathan* carefully, none of this complicated exegesis would have been necessary. The Aramaic translation of the Hebrew text of Gen 19:17: ויהי כהוציאם אתם החוצה, reads in *Pseudo-Jonathan*:

> והוה באפקתהון יתהון לברא והדר חד מנהון לסדום לחבלותא וחד אשתאר עם לוט ואמר לה

> And when they had taken them outside, one of them returned to Sodom to destroy it, and the other remained with Lot and said to him: etc.

[16] English translation by H. Freedman, *The Midrash Rabbah: Genesis* (London: Soncino, 1977), 433–34.

But then, of course, we should have been deprived of the names of the two angels. We may even have thought that the one who destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah was the same God who in Gen 19:24 "rained brimstone and fire from heaven" and not the "he" who in Gen 19:25 overthrew the cities, i.e., the angel Gabriel.

2. What Were the Sins of Sodom?

This question may seem nonsensical, particularly in view of the discussion of "sodomy" by Vandermeersch.[17] But our reading of the targumim suggests that in the earlier interpretations of the biblical story the sins that brought about the destruction of Sodom were not understood in the way our use of the words "sodomites" or "sodomy" may suggest, at least not primarily. The only possible connection between Sodom and sexual misconduct is to be found in Gen 19:5, where the people of Sodom demand that Lot give them the two men to "know" them (ונדעה). This verb is translated in *Pseudo-Jonathan* very explicitly with ונשמש, "couple with."[18] *Neofiti* uses the verb ונחכם, a verb which very seldom conveys the sexual connotation of the Hebrew ידע. The Hebrew verb used in the story, and the subsequent offer of Lot's two virgin daughters as sexual objects for the men of Sodom, show that the intention of the inhabitants of Sodom was to rape the man-like angels. But, as was shown by Mulder,[19] this rape has more to do with the popular misoxenia contrasted with the hospitality offered by Lot than with any sort of "sodomy." In any case, the connection between Sodom and "sodomy" is not reflected in the haggadah of the targumim, which, as we will see in the analysis of Gen 18:20, gives us another definition of the sins of Sodom.

This is less surprising than might appear at first sight. In the whole of Abraham's dialogue with God, which, as proved by Noort's contribution,[20] serves as a prologue to the story of the destruction, the contrast is between the "righteous" (צדיק) and the "wicked" (רשע), and there is no hint at all in the text that identifies the type of wickedness in which the men of Sodom participated. This is not, of course, the first biblical reference to

---

[17] See below, 149–71.

[18] Translated by M. Maher as "that we may have sexual relations with them." See *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis* (ArBib 1B; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992), 70.

[19] M. J. Mulder, *Sodom en Gomorra: een verhaal van dode steden* (Exegetische Studies 4; Kampen: Kok, 1988), 41.

[20] See above, 3–15.

the sinfulness of Sodom. In Gen 13:13 we find: ואנשי סדם רעים וחטאים ליהוה מאד "But the men of Sodom were wicked (רעים) and sinners (וחט־אים) before the Lord exceedingly (מאד)." These two qualifications of the biblical text for the sins of Sodom are general enough to cover every sin we can imagine. But because they are two, they need to be explained. *Neofiti* translates:

> ועמה דסדם בישין גבר לחבריה וחייבין בגילוי עריתה ובשפיכות אדמייה ובפלחנא נכרייה קדם יי לחדה
>
> And the people of Sodom were evil, one towards the other, and were very guilty before the Lord of revealing (their) nakedness and of the shedding of blood[21] and of foreign worship. (*Tg. Neof. Gen* 13:13)

The wickedness of the people of Sodom is interpreted here as "being evil one towards the other," and among their sins only the first ("revealing the nakedness") has a sexual connotation, although the expression used is too general to possibly be identified with any form of sodomy. *Pseudo-Jonathan* provides a similar interpretation:

> ואינשין דסדום בישין בממונהון דין לדין וחייבין בגופיהון בגילוי ערייתא ושדייות אדם זכוי ופלחן פולחנא נכראה ומרדין לשמא דיי לחדא
>
> And the men of Sodom were evil in their riches one with the other, and sinners in their bodies revealing (their) nakedness, and pouring innocent blood, worshipping foreign idols, and revolting very much against the name of the Lord. (*Tg. Ps.-J. Gen* 13:13)

Pseudo-Jonathan specifies that being evil towards one another was understood in economic terms, and adds the men of Sodom's revolt against the name of the Lord to the list of sins. But here, too, the link with sodomy is absent. The same can be said of the rabbinic tradition, as a single example of the interpretation of the sentence in *b. Sanh.* 109a–b shows:

> The men of Sodom have no portion in the world to come, etc. Our Rabbis taught: The men of Sodom have no portion in the future world, as it is written, But the men of Sodom were wicked and sinners before the Lord exceedingly (Gen 13:13) wicked—in this world, and sinners—in respect of the world to come. Rab Judah said: [They were] wicked—with their bodies [i.e. immoral] and sinners—with their money [i.e. uncharitable]. Wicked—with their bodies, as it is written, How then can I do this great wickedness, and sin against God? (Gen 39:9) And sinners—with their money, as it is written, and it be sin unto thee. (Deut 15:9) Before the Lord refers to blasphemy; exceedingly—that they intentionally sinned. A Tanna taught:

[21] In the margin, "innocent" is added to "blood."

> Wicked—with their money; and sinners—with their bodies. Wicked—with their money, as it is written, And thine eye be wicked against thy poor brother (Deut 15:9); and sinners—with their bodies, as it is written, and I will sin against God. (Gen 39:9) Before the Lord—this refers to blasphemy. Exceedingly—this refers to bloodshed, as it is written, Moreover, Manasseh shed innocent blood exceedingly (2 Kgs 21:16). (*b. Sanh.* 109a–b)[22]

A quick look at the other biblical references to the sins of Sodom within the Bible yields some more clues; nevertheless, the precise definition of these sins remains elusive, and the link with sodomy totally absent. Jeremiah, for example, reads:

> But in the prophets of Jerusalem I have seen a horrible thing: they commit adultery (שערורה נאוף) and walk in lies, and strengthen also the hands of evil-doers, so that none returns from his wickedness; they are all of them to me like Sodom, and its habitants like Gomorrah. (Jer 23:14)

More concrete is Ezekiel when describing the iniquity (עון) of Sodom:

> Behold, this was the iniquity of your sister Sodom: pride, surfeit of bread, and abundance of idleness was in her and in her daughters; and she did not strengthen the hand of the poor and needy. And they were haughty, and committed abomination before me; therefore I took them away when I saw it. (Ezek 16:49–50)

Here, not even "adultery" is mentioned, and the only term used that could carry a "sexual" connotation, among many others, is תועבה, "abomination." The emphasis in this long list of Sodom's sins is on what could be described as "social sins" in the first instance, and as pride and haughtiness in the second. In the rabbinic tradition these two elements are the ones most often commented upon. I cannot resist quoting here one extract from the Babli that describes the iniquities of the men of Sodom, and shows how Eliezer, Abraham's servant, outwitted them:

> There were four judges in Sodom, [named] Shakrai, Shakurai, Zayyafi, and Mazle Dina. Now, if a man assaulted his neighbour's wife and bruised her, they would say [to the husband], "Give her to him, that she may become pregnant for thee." If one cut off the ear of his neighbour's ass, they would order, "Give it to him until it grows again." If one wounded his neighbour they would say to him [the victim], "Give him a fee for bleeding thee." He who crossed over with the ferry had to pay four zuzim, whilst he who crossed

[22] English translation by H. Freedman, in *Hebrew-English Edition of the Babylonian Talmud: Sanhedrin.* New Edition (London: Soncino, 1969), loc. cit. (with the references inserted).

> through the water had to pay eight. On one occasion, a certain fuller happened to come there. Said they to him, "Give us four zuzim [for the use of the ferry]." But, protested he, "I crossed through the water!" "If so," said they, "thou must give eight zuzim for passing through the water." He refused to give it, so they assaulted him. He went before the judge, who ordered, "Give them a fee for bleeding and eight zuzim for crossing through the water." Now Eliezer, Abraham's servant, happened to be there, and was attacked. When he went before the judge, he said, "Give them a fee for bleeding thee." Thereupon he took a stone and smote the judge. "What is this!" he exclaimed. He replied, "The fee that thou owest me give to this man [who attacked me], whilst my money will remain in statu quo." Now, they had beds upon which travellers slept. If he [the guest] was too long, they shortened him [by lopping off his feet]; if too short, they stretched him out. Eliezer, Abraham's servant, happened to go there. Said they to him, "Arise and sleep on this bed!" He replied, "I have vowed since the day of my mother's death not to sleep in a bed." If a poor man happened to come there, every resident gave him a denar, upon which he wrote his name, but no bread was given him. When he died, each came and took back his. They made this agreement amongst themselves: whoever invites a man [a stranger] to a feast shall be stripped of his garment. Now, a banquet was in progress, when Eliezer chanced there, but they gave him no bread. Wishing to dine, he went and sat down at the end of them all. Said they to him, "Who invited thee here?" He replied to the one sitting near him, "Thou didst invite me." The latter said to himself, "Peradventure they will hear that I invited him, and strip me of my garments!" So he took up his raiment and fled without. Thus he [Eliezer] did to all, until they had all gone; whereupon he consumed the entire repast. (*b. Sanh.* 109b)[23]

With all this in mind we can now understand the second targumic text I want to present, *Pseudo-Jonathan* of Gen 18:20. The Hebrew text reads: "And the Lord said: because the cry of Sodom and Gomorrah is great, and because their sin is very grievous." *Pseudo-Jonathan* translates:

> ואמר ייי למלאכי שיריתא קבילת סדם ועמרה דאניסין מסכינין וגזרין דכל דיהיב פיתא לעניא ייקד בנורא ארום סגיאת וחובתהון ארום תקיפת לחדא

> And the Lord said to the ministering angels: the plaint of Sodom and Gomorrah—that they oppress the poor and legislated that all who give bread to the poor should be burnt by fire—is surely great and their sin has increased greatly.

The echo of Ezekiel's text is clear, and it proves that the sins of Sodom were not understood as sexual deviations of any sort. In our text only the social dimensions of the sins of Sodom are brought to the fore. In the

---

[23] Freedman, *Sanhedrin*, loc. cit.

social world of the targumist they were thought of as more important than sodomy. This verse brings us directly to our third point, *Pseudo-Jonathan*'s translation of Gen 18:21.

3. Who was Pelitit?

One of the most surprising characters in the story of Sodom, as it is told in *Pseudo-Jonathan*, is the girl Pelitit, who appears suddenly in the translation of Gen 18:21. The King James Version renders the Hebrew:

> I will go down now, and see whether they have done altogether according to the cry of it, which is come unto me; and if not, I will know.

In the Aramaic translation of *Pseudo-Jonathan*[24] this becomes:

> אתגלי כדון ואחמי הא כקבילתא דריבא פליטית דעלתא קומוי עבדו גמירא הינון חייבין ואם עבדין תתובא הלא הינון קדמיי זכאין כמא דלא ידעית ולא איתפרע
>
> I will now be revealed, and I will see if they have done according to the clamour of the girl Pelitit which has ascended before me; (if this is so) they merit destruction; but if they do penance they will be innocent before me as (if) I did not know, and I will not take revenge.

The descent of God is, as is usual in *Pseudo-Jonathan*, translated in the terms of divine revelation. That God should have given the people of the city the possibility to repent is in line with Ezekiel's text and with the theological outlook of the targumim.[25]

Even the presence of a girl could somehow be expected. In fact, the Hebrew word הכצעקתה in the MT has a clear feminine suffix, which already posed a problem to the ancient translators. The LXX and the Vulgata opt for ignoring it. *Onqelos* changes the feminine singular suffix into a third plural masculine form, referring the cry to the men of Sodom (הכקבילתהון, "their cry," or "the cry over them"); *Neofiti* reads a second person masculine suffix (כקבילתהיה, "his cry"), which refers back to the

[24] The targumic text has been thoroughly studied by M. J. Mulder, *Het meisje van Sodom: De targumim op Genesis 18:20,21 tussen bijbeltekst en haggada* (Kampen: Kok, 1970).

[25] This possibility of repentance is also asserted in the other targumim, including *Onqelos*, albeit with different wording. In *Neofiti* we read: "They are sinners and if they ask to do penance, and they expect in their souls that their evil works may not be manifest before me, behold they are before me as if I did not know them." Very similar is the wording of the Fragment Targum MS 440 and 110. In the margin of *Neofiti*, we find a short formulation: "They are sinners but if they ask to do penance, behold they are before me as if I did not know." The possibility of repentance is also asserted in *Gen. Rab.* 49:6.

word "the people" (עמא) of Sodom and Gomorrah, which was used in the translation of verse 20. The Fragment Targum (MS 440 and 110) has a plural suffix (הכקבילתהון), but specifies directly afterwards that it refers to the people of Sodom and Gomorrah (דעמא דסדום ועמורה): "their cry over the people of Sodom and Gomorrah."

It is perfectly possible that the MT with the feminine suffix does not represent the original text. The Qumran manuscript 4Q180, as completed by Strugnell,[26] reads הזעקתמה (with a third person masculine suffix), and this is the reading adopted in the *DSSSE*.[27] This reading may already be a correction of the more difficult masoretic reading, or may represent the original. In any case, *Pseudo-Jonathan* takes the lectio difficilior of the Hebrew text seriously, with a singular feminine pronoun, and translates it as כקבילתא דריבא פליטית, "according to the outcry of the girl Pelitit."

The interpretative function of *Pseudo-Jonathan*'s gloss is clear; but where does the girl come from? And who was she? A midrash, preserved in *Pirqe Rabbi Eliezer*, provides the answer. She was the daughter of Lot:

> R. Jehudah said: They made a proclamation in Sodom (saying): Everyone who strengthens the hand of the poor or the needy with a loaf of bread shall be burnt by fire. Peletith, daughter of Lot, was wedded to one of the magnates of Sodom. She saw a certain very poor man in the street of the city, and her soul was grieved on his account, as it is said: "Was not my soul grieved for the needy?" (Job 30:25). What did she do? Every day when she went out to draw water she put in her bucket all sort of provisions from her home, and she fed that poor man. The men of Sodom said: How does this poor man live? When they ascertained the facts, they brought her forth to be burnt with fire. She said: Sovereign of all worlds! Maintain my right and my cause (at the hands of) the men of Sodom. And her cry ascended before the Throne of Glory. In that hour the Holy One, blessed be He, said: "I will now descend and I will see" (Gen 18:21) whether the men of Sodom have done according to the cry of this young woman. I will turn her foundations upwards, and the surface thereof shall be turned downwards, as it is said, "I will now descend, and I will see whether they have done altogether according to her cry, which is come unto me" (ibid.). "According to their cry" is not written here (in the text), only "According to her cry." (*Pirqe R. El.* 25)[28]

---

[26] J. Strugnell, "Notes en marge du volume V des 'Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan'," *RevQ* 7 (1969–70): 163–276 at 253–54.

[27] *DSSSE*, 372.

[28] Friedlander, *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer*, 182–83.

The beginning of the midrash shows such clear correspondence with the Aramaic translation of *Pseudo-Jonathan* of Gen 18:20 that it seems certain that both are related, and it is very probable that *Pseudo-Jonathan* is here dependent on and summarising the midrash. Both are related to the Ezek 16:49 text already quoted. The end of the midrash makes the exegetical function of the story clear, with the explicit desire of preserving and defending the masoretic reading as it was known to the authors. *Pirqe Rabbi Eliezer* does not reveal where the story comes from. Mulder[29] has placed it in connection with a similar story, found in the Babylonian Talmud:

> A certain maiden gave some bread to a poor man, [hiding it] in a pitcher. On the matter becoming known, they daubed her with honey and placed her on the parapet of the wall, and the bees came and consumed her. Thus it is written, And the Lord said, The cry of Sodom and Gomorrah, because it is great (רבה) (Gen 18:20): whereon Rab Judah commented in Rab's name: On account of the maiden [ריבה]. (*b. Sanh.* 109b)[30]

In this story, the girl is anonymous and the exegetical sleight-of-hand different (a play on the reading רבה in the Hebrew text, understood as ריבה), but I think Mulder is right in considering it another version of the same story, and in considering the Pelitit version as secondary. These two versions of the story have been blended together in one of the comments to Gen 18:21 found in *Genesis Rabbah*.

> R. Levi said: [God said]: "Even if I wished to keep silent, justice for a certain maiden (ribah) does not permit Me to keep silent." For it once happened that two damsels went down to draw water from a well. Said one to the other, "Why are you so pale?" "We have no more food left and are ready to die," replied she. What did she do? She filled her pitcher with flour and they exchanged [their pitchers], each taking the other's. When they [the Sodomites] discovered this, they took and burnt her. Said the Holy One, blessed be He: "Even if I desired to be silent, justice for that maiden does not permit Me to keep silent." Hence it does not say, whether they have done according to their cry; but according to her cry—the cry of that maiden. (*Gen. Rab.* 49:6)[31]

Here, the girl remains anonymous but she is burned, and the midrash blends both exegetical clues: the reading of ריבה for רבה of the Talmud, and the defence of the feminine suffix of the targum.

---

[29] Mulder, *Sodom en Gomorra*, 63–64.
[30] Freedman, *Sanhedrin*, loc. cit.
[31] Freedman, *The Midrash Rabbah: Genesis*, 425.

One final note before closing. The unnamed girl of the Talmud died consumed by bees, the girl of *Genesis Rabbah* was consumed by fire, while we may assume that Pelitit, as one of the two daughters of Lot, was saved, and as such obtained progeny by her father, thus giving birth either to Ammon or to Moab. By this unholy means, she became one of the ancestors of the expected Messiah.

CHAPTER NINE

HAGAR IN *TARGUM PSEUDO-JONATHAN*

1. Introduction

This paper will present the figure of Hagar as described in *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan*, a late Targum, but one which has preserved several of the traditions built around the figure of the maidservant of Sarah, the mother of Ishmael.[1] Some of these traditions may be much older, as they are partially attested to in the Qumran texts, in *Jubilees*, or in the New Testament.[2] I have grouped the information gathered in my reading of the *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* under three headings: the origins and status of Hagar, the description of Ishmael, and the dispute between Ishmael and Isaac.

2. The Origins and Status of Hagar

The information provided by the two biblical texts which deal with the origins and status of Hagar (Gen 16:1–16; 21:9–20) is scanty. They provide the name Hagar and state that she is an Egyptian maidservant or slave (שפחה מצרית). Hagar's Egyptian origins are thus established in the biblical text.[3] However, as always, the haggadah tries to be more precise by building upon the scarce data provided by the biblical text. In column 20 of the *Genesis Apocryphon* from Qumran Cave 1,[4] a text which develops the narrative of Genesis, we can read:

---

[1] I will use the edition of the *Tg. Ps.-J.* in Genesis, Volume 50.1 of *Biblia Polyglotta Matritensia. Series IV: Targum Palaestinense in Pentateuchum. Additur Targum Pseudojonatan ejusque hispanica versio* (ed. A. Díez Macho; Madrid: CSIC, 1988).

[2] Although *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* is closely related to the *Pirqe Rabbi Eliezer* and most of the traditions are common to both compositions (including naming the preferred wife of Mohammed, Adisha [Ayisha], and his daughter, Fatima, as the wives of Ishmael; cf. *Tg. Ps.-J. Gen.* 21:21; *Pirqe R. El.* 30:3), I will refrain from using the *Pirqe Rabbi Eliezer* as an illustration of the developments of the *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan*.

[3] See M. Görg, "Hagar, die Ägypterin," *BN* 33 (1980): 17–20 and in more detail, S. J. Teubal, *Hagar the Egyptian: The Lost Tradition of the Matriarchs* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1990).

[4] N. Avigad and Y. Yadin, *A Genesis Apocryphon: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1956).

> Then, they [brought back to] me Sarai. The king gave her (ויהב לה מלכא) [silver and go]ld and much fine linen and purple and [. . .] in front of her and also Hagar (קודמיהא ואף להגר). He h[an]ded her to me, and appointed men to escort me and to . . . out of Egypt. (1QapGen 20:30–32)[5]

Unfortunately, this text is neither complete nor very explicit. Nevertheless, it provides us with a new piece of information concerning the origins of Hagar as well as an explanation of the qualification "Egyptian" found in the biblical text. Hagar was given to Sarah when the latter was in Egypt with Abraham, and she was a gift from the Pharaoh himself (at this point the text simply calls him King [מלכא]. However, the preceding lines of the narrative[6] inform us that he was the Pharaoh Zoan [פרעו צען]). Thus, according to the *Genesis Apocryphon*, Hagar was given to Sarah, together with a number of other items, to compensate her for the two years she spent in captivity[7] at the Pharaoh's court after the courtiers praised her beauty. The Qumran text tells us how Abraham prayed for the Pharaoh and finally cured him and his household, when the true nature of Sarah and Abraham's relationship—they were husband and wife rather than brother and sister—was revealed. After receiving the gifts from the Pharaoh, the patriarchs left Egypt, taking Hagar with them. The Qumran text says explicitly that it is the Pharaoh who gives Hagar to Sarah, thus placing her origins clearly within the royal entourage of the Pharaoh, but the text is silent on the question of who Hagar's real father is. *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* answers this question unambiguously and makes Hagar a daughter of the Pharaoh, although without specifying the name of the Pharaoh. Commenting on Gen 16:1 after a faithful translation of the biblical text, *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* has a specific addition that is not found in any other Targumim. There we can read:

> Sarai, Abram's wife, bore him no children; but she had an Egyptian maid whose name was Hagar, *a daughter of Pharaoh, whom he gave to her as maid when he took her and was smitten by a word from before the Lord.* (*Tg. Ps.-J. Gen.* 16:1)[8]

The terminology employed leaves no doubt: Hagar is ברת פרעה ("a daughter of Pharaoh") and she was given to Sarah בזמן דנסבא ("at the

---

[5] *DSSSE*, 1:43.

[6] 1QapGen 19:24; 20:4.

[7] 1QapGen 20:18.

[8] Translation by M. J. Maher, trans., introd., and comm., *Targum Pseudo Jonathan: Genesis* (ArBib 1B; Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 1992), 62. As is usual in Targumic studies, italics in the translation indicate where the Targum differs from the Hebrew text.

time when he took her as wife") and was struck by a divine word (as in the translation of Maher above) or the Memra, which is also a possible translation. This episode in the life of Abraham is clearly the same as that which can be read in greater detail in the *Genesis Apocryphon*. The Pharaoh in *Pseudo-Jonathan* on Gen 16:1 remains anonymous, but at the end of the translation of Gen 16:5 we find that this Pharaoh is none other than the son of the infamous Nimrod: "so that we will not need the children of Hagar, the daughter of Pharaoh, the son of Nimrod who threw you into the furnace of fire." This mention of Nimrod as the grandfather of Hagar (ברת פרעה בר נימרוד) is very surprising and difficult to understand.[9] The only explanation I can find for making the Babylonian king the father of the Egyptian Pharaoh is the insistence on idolatry that we find in some of the elements *Pseudo-Jonathan* adds to the story of Hagar and Ishmael. For example, commenting on Gen 11:28, in a long addition to the Hebrew text which explains why Haran, the brother of Abraham, died before his father Terah, *Pseudo-Jonathan* introduces Nimrod, depicting him as the personal enemy of Abraham, stating that he attempted to have Abraham burnt alive because he refused to worship idols:

> *It came to pass, when Nimrod cast Abram into the furnace of fire because he would not worship his idol, the fire had no power to burn him. Then Haran was undecided, and he said: "If Nimrod triumphs, I will be on his side; but if Abram triumphs, I will be on his side." And when all the people who were there saw that the fire has no power over Abram, they said to themselves: "Is not Haran the brother of Abram full of divination and sorcery? It is he who uttered charms over the fire so that it would not burn his brother." Immediately fire fell from the heavens on high and consumed him*; and Haran died in the sight of Terah his father, *being burned* in the land of his birth *in the furnace of fire which* the Chaldeans *had made for Abram his brother*. (*Tg. Ps.-J. Gen.* 11:28)[10]

Targum Pseudo-Jonathan associates Hagar and Ishmael with idolatry, as we shall see below, which is perhaps the rationale for the strange genealogy that the Targum gives to Hagar, linking her to the Pharaoh of Egypt as a daughter, as well as the Babylonian King Nimrod as a granddaughter.[11]

This surprising information on the origins of Hagar is contained in a passionate outburst made by Sarah. In the Hebrew text (Gen 16:5), on

---

[9] This is not attested to, as far as I know, in other Jewish sources.

[10] Maher, *Pseudo Jonathan*, 51.

[11] *Pseudo-Jonathan* seems to have had a special interest in Nimrod, for in the translation of Gen 25:27 he has Esau kill the hated King and his son Enoch: דהוא קטל ית נמרוד ויית חנוך בריה.

discovering that Hagar is pregnant, Sarah blames Abraham for her humiliation: "The wrong done to me is your fault!" She asserts that from the moment Hagar became pregnant "I am lowered in her esteem," and prays for the intervention of God, "The Lord decide between you and me!" God, as it were, is called upon to decide in the dispute between Abraham and Sarah. In *Pseudo-Jonathan* the emphasis is completely different with there being no real dispute between the spouses. Only one party is humiliated (i.e., Sarah), and peace and prosperity can only be attained when this humiliation is manifest before the Lord. Sarah adds the reasons why her grief is justified: it was she who followed Abraham into a foreign land, she who freed Hagar and gave her to Abraham and she whose honour was defiled. Moreover, she blames all this on a descendant of the hated Nimrod, who originally exiled Abraham and Sarah from their homeland. In *Tg. Ps.-J. Gen.* 16:5 we can read:

> Sarai said to Abram, "*All* my humiliation (*comes*) *from you, because I trusted that you would do me justice,* (*seeing*) *that I left my country and my father's house and went with you into a foreign land. And now, because I have not borne children, I set* my maid *free* and gave her (*to you*) *to lie* in your bosom. But when she saw that she was with child, *my honor was despised* in her sight. *Now let my humiliation be manifest before* the Lord, *and let him spread his peace between me and you, and let the earth be filled from us, so that we will not need the children of Hagar, the daughter of Pharaoh, the son of Nimrod, who threw you into the furnace of fire.*" (*Tg. Ps.-J. Gen.* 16:5)[12]

It is interesting to see how the different Targumim present this accusation that Sarah makes. *Targum Onqelos* softens her accusation to "I have cause for a legal complaint against you." *Pseudo-Jonathan*, as we have already seen, presents it as a given fact that Abraham has done wrong. In this respect, *Targum Neofiti I* gives an even more detailed account of the accusation, which is worth quoting in full because it provides a summary of Sarah's grief:

> And Sarai said to Abram: "My judgment and my humiliation, my insult and the beginning of my affliction are given unto your hand. I forsook my country and the house of my birth and the house of my father, and I came with you with faith. I went in with you before the kings of the earth, before the Pharaoh king of Egypt and before Abimelech king of Gerar and I said: 'He is my brother,' so that they may not kill you. And when I saw that I did not bear, I took Hagar the Egyptian, my handmaid, and gave her to you as wife, and I said: 'She will bear children and I will rear (them). Perhaps I too will have

[12] Maher, *Pseudo Jonathan*, 62.

> children through her.' But when she saw that she had conceived my honour was of little value in her sight. And, now, let the Lord be revealed and let him judge between me and you, and let him spread his peace between me and you and let the earth be filled from us and we will not need the sons of Hagar the Egyptian, who belongs to the sons of the sons of the people who gave you to the furnace of fire of the Chaldeans."[13]

In Gen 16:1, Hagar has the same status as in the biblical text: she is a "handmaid," an Egyptian slave (*Tg. Neof.*: אמתה מצרייא; *Tg. Ps.-J.*: אמתא מצריתא, which is a straightforward translation of the Hebrew שפחה מצרית). However, in the translation of Gen 16:2 she has already been promised her freedom, and by v. 3 she is already a free woman:

> 2 Sarai said to Abram, "Behold, I pray, the Lord has prevented me from bearing children. Now, go in to my maid, *and I will set her free* (ואחררינה). Perhaps I may have children through her." And Abram listened to the word of Sarai. 3 Sarai, Abram's wife, took Hagar the Egyptian, her maid—after Abram had dwelt in the land of Canaan for ten years—*set her free* (וחררתה) and gave her to Abram her husband as wife (לאינתו). (*Tg. Ps.-J. Gen.* 16:2–3)[14]

The reason for making Hagar a free woman is certainly to prevent Abraham from becoming the father of a slave's child, something that could bring dishonour upon the patriarch.[15] The Targum repeats this affirmation in relation to Gen 16:5, "I set my maid free" (חררית אמתי). It is true that *Pseudo-Jonathan* is not completely consistent on the matter. When translating Gen 21:14, where Abraham sends Hagar away after giving her bread and water and placing them on her shoulders with the child, the Aramaic text adds: "tying (them) to her loins *to show that she was a maidservant*" (לאודעי דאמתא היא). Nevertheless, the assertion that Hagar was a free woman is repeated three times in our text. This is the best explanation *Pseudo-Jonathan* gives of Hagar's status. Hagar is clearly shown to be a wife of Abraham because when he sends her away he gives her a proper bill of divorce, a *get*, something a slave would not have received: "He (Abraham) sent her away *with a bill of divorce*" (ופטרה בגיטא), as stated in the *Pseudo-Jonathan* translation of Gen 21:14.

---

[13] Translation by M. McNamara and M. J. Maher in A. Díez Macho, ed., *Neophyti 1: Tomo 1: Génesis* (TECC 7; Madrid: CSIC, 1968), 534. No italics are used in this translation.

[14] Maher, *Pseudo Jonathan*, 62.

[15] In the Islamic tradition this element is not important, because the status of both women either as wife or concubine is irrelevant, cf. F. Leemhuis, "Ibrāhīm's Sacrifice of His Son and the Early Post-Koranic Tradition," in *The Sacrifice of Isaac: The Aqedah* (*Genesis 22*) *and Its Interpretations* (ed. E. Noort and E. Tigchelaar; TBN 4; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 128, n.3.

Pseudo-Jonathan also makes Hagar a wife of Abraham in its translation of Gen 25:1, on the basis of identifying her as Keturah. The same point is made by a marginal gloss of *Neofiti* and by mss 110 and 440. All these witnesses agree on this essential point (that Keturah is another name for Hagar), but disagree on the verb used to express the reason for her being identified in this way. The first marginal gloss of *Neofiti* (M1) and mss 110 and 440 use the verb אסר ("to tie up"): ושמה קטורא היא הות הגר דהות אסירה לה מן שירריה ("and her name was Keturah, this was Hagar who was tied to him from the beginning"), but *Pseudo-Jonathan* and the second marginal gloss of *Neofiti* (M2) use the verb קטר ("to bind") and read: ושמא קטורא היא הגר דקטירא ליה מן שרריה ("and her name was Keturah, this was Hagar who was bound to him from the beginning"), clearly linking the name Keturah with the verb קטר, suggesting that Hagar was indeed bound to Abraham from the beginning.

Another peculiar element of Hagar's status in *Pseudo-Jonathan* is that she is presented as the recipient of divine revelations. Having fled from Sarah to the wilderness the Angel of the Lord finds her and entreats her to return to Sarah explaining the future of her child. *Pseudo-Jonathan* translates the difficult Gen 16:13 passage as follows:[16]

> She *gave thanks before* the Lord *whose Memra* had spoken to her *and she spoke thus*, "You are *the Living and Enduring One, who sees but is not seen,*" for she said, "*Behold, here indeed the Glory of the Shekinah of the Lord was revealed, vision after vision.*" (*Tg. Ps.-J. Gen.* 16:13)[17]

Pseudo-Jonathan understands "called the name of the Lord" as giving thanks or praying, interprets אל ראי (*ēl rŏ'i*) as a doubly divine title based on the interpretation of לחי ראי (*laḥai ro'i*) in the verse that follows, and presents the whole episode as a continuous revelation (חזוא בתר חזוא). *Targum Neofiti I* is even more explicit in placing Hagar's words in the context of a revelation: אף כדון יתגלי עלי מן בתר דאתגלי על שרי רבונתי ("Behold also now he has been revealed to me after he has been revealed to my mistress Sarah").[18] Manuscripts 110 and 440 bring together the elements of *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* and *Targum Neofiti*:

> And Hagar gave thanks and prayed in the name of the Memra of the Lord who was revealed to her and to Sarai her mistress and said: "Blessed are you,

---

[16] On the difficulties of the Hebrew text, see T. Booij, "Hagar's Words in Genesis XVI 13b," *VT* 30 (1980): 1–7.

[17] Maher, *Pseudo Jonathan*, 63.

[18] Díez Macho, *Neophyti 1. 1.,* 89, 535.

> the God who endures for all centuries and has seen my anguish." Behold she said "Also to me he has been revealed now, after he has been revealed to Sarai my mistress."[19] (mss 110 and 440)

Pseudo-Jonathan is most explicit on the second occasion in which Hagar is presented as the recipient of a revelation. In Gen 21:19, after the Lord has heard the voice of the suffering Ishmael and opens Hagar's eyes so that she can see the well of water, all the Targumim stay faithful to the Hebrew text, with only *Pseudo-Jonathan* adding that the well of water was revealed to Hagar:

> *The Lord* uncovered her eyes and a well of water *was revealed to her* (ואיתגלי לה) and she went and filled the water-skin with water, and gave the boy to drink. (*Tg. Ps.-J. Gen.* 21:19)[20]

3. The Description of Ishmael

We find a description of Ishmael in two places in *Pseudo-Jonathan*. Before his birth, in the translation of Gen 16:11–12, the Angel of the Lord describes Ishmael to Hagar as follows:

> The Angel of the Lord said to her, "Behold, you are with child, and you shall bear a son. You shall call his name Ishmael, because your affliction *has been revealed before* the Lord. He shall be *like* a wild ass *among the children of men*; his hands will *take revenge on his enemies*, and the hands of his enemies will be stretched forth to harm him. He shall dwell alongside all his kinsmen *and he shall be mixed* (*with them*). (*Tg. Ps.-J. Gen.* 16:11–12)[21]

In the Aramaic translation the account of the Angel of the Lord does not provide us with many details which were not already known from the biblical text. By using the verb גלה instead of the verb שמע to introduce the idea of revelation, *Pseudo-Jonathan* has even lost the etymology of the name Ishmael that is present in the Hebrew text, which is preserved in the other Targumim such as *Neofiti*: ותיקרי שמה ישמעאל ארום שמיע קדם ייי ית צעריך ("and you will call his name Ishmael, because your afflictions have been heard before the Lord"; cf. Gen 16:11). The "wild ass of a man" (פרא אדם) of the Hebrew text, is transformed into "like a wild ass among the

[19] My translation of the text of ms 110: ואדיאת הגר וצליאת בשם מימרא דיי דאיתגלי עלה ועל שרי ריבונתהא ואמרת בריך את הוא אלהא קיים לעלמיא וחמית בצערי ארום אמרת הלחוד על איתגליאת היך בתר דאיתגליא על שרי ריבונתי (Martínez, *Biblia Polyglotta*, 103).

[20] Maher, *Pseudo Jonathan*, 76.

[21] Ibid., 63.

children of men" (מדמי לערוד בבני נשא). *Pseudo-Jonathan* adds that Ishmael will take revenge on his enemies and, in particular, that he and his descendents "will be mixed" with them. The wording used (יתערבב from the root ערבב) seems to imply a play on ערב, the Arabs, thereby casting Ishmael as an ancestor of the Arabs,[22] but it can also be understood as simply indicating that Ishmael and his descendents will dwell among the nations and mix with them.

We find more details in the second description, after the birth of Ishmael, in the translation of Gen 21. While in the biblical text the only reason given for the expulsion is Sarah's wish to prevent Ishmael from obtaining part of the inheritance she wants to preserve for Isaac, *Pseudo-Jonathan* adds other reasons in order to justify Abraham's decision to comply with Sarah's request and banish Hagar and Ishmael. *Pseudo-Jonathan* states that God himself asserts that Sarah is a prophetess and that Ishmael shall not be recorded in Abraham's genealogy. Moreover, not only is the question of the inheritance brought to the fore but also the future military conflict between the two peoples. It is most characteristic that *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* has God accuse Ishmael of having abandoned the training Abraham gave him and more particularly of practising idolatry, an accusation which is repeated twice in three verses. The most telling change is that found in Gen 21:13, where God's positive promise to create a great people[23] from the son of the servant is transformed in *Pseudo-Jonathan* into creating "a people of robbers" from him, to the extent of using the Greek loan word *lestēs* to make the matter clear (לעם ליסטיס):

> Sarah saw the son of Hagar the Egyptian, whom she bore to Abraham, *sporting with an idol and bowing down to it.* And she said to Abraham, "Cast out this maidservant and her son; for *it is not possible that* the son of this maidservant should inherit with my son *and* (*then*) *make war with* Isaac." But the matter was distressing in Abraham's eyes on account of his son Ishmael, *who had practiced idolatry*. But the Lord said to Abraham, "Do not be distressed about the boy *who has abandoned the training you have given him*, or about your maidservant whom you *are banishing. Pay heed* to all that Sarah will say to you—*for she is a prophetess*—because through Isaac shall your children be named, *but this son of the maidservant shall not be recorded* (*in the*

[22] See F. Millar, "Hagar, Ishmael, Josephus and the Origins of Islam," *JJS* 44 (1993): 23–45.

[23] MT reads only "people" (לגוי) but most of the other witnesses (the Samaritan, Greek, Syriac, and Latin) read "great people" (לגוי גדול).

> *genealogies*) *after you*. And I will make a nation *of robbers* of the son of the maidservant also, because he is your *son*. (*Tg. Ps.-J. Gen.* 21:10–13)[24]

The way the rest of the story is told illustrates that the accusation of idolatry is important to the editor of the *Pseudo-Jonathan*. In the story Abraham provides water for Hagar and Ishmael, certainly enough for them to reach Beer-sheba, and he is therefore not to blame if they stray from the path and become lost in the desert. Nor can he be blamed if they revert to idolatry and, as a result, Ishmael is punished with a burning fever that causes him to drink all the water. Even then, Hagar does not request the help of God but summons the "fear of her father" (וקרא לדחלתא דאיבה), the god of the Pharaoh who, of course, does not answer her. Only when Hagar rejects the "foreign idolatry" (פולחנא נוכראה) and withdraws from her son do things begin to change:

> She went off and strayed *from the way,* to the desert *which is near* Beer-sheba*. When they arrived at the entrance of the desert, they reverted to going astray after idolatry. Ishmael was stricken with a burning fever and he drank all the water until all* the water in the skin was finished. And *his flesh became parched and thin. So she carried him, and* (*when*) *she was exhausted she called to the god of her father, but he did not answer her. And immediately* she threw the child under one of the *trees*. She went and sat down *to one side, threw away the idol and withdrew from her son*, about *the distance of* a bowshot; for she said, "I am not *able* to look upon the death of the child." So she sat opposite *her son* and lifted up her voice and wept. (*Tg. Ps.-J. Gen.* 21:15–16)[25]

Once Hagar renounces idolatry the Lord is ready to hear the boy's cries. However, *Pseudo-Jonathan* emphasizes that salvation will not come because of any merit on their part or because of their suffering, but that it is exclusively due to the merit of Abraham (בגין זכותיה דאברהם). It is not the deeds (the past or the future) of Ishmael that count, but it is exclusively the merit of Abraham that provides solace:

> The voice of the child *was* heard *before the Lord because of the merit of Abraham*. And the Angel *of the Lord* called to Hagar from heaven and said to her, "What is the matter, Hagar? Fear not, for the voice of the child *has been* heard *before the Lord, and he has not judged him according to the evil deeds he is destined to do. Because of the merit of Abraham he has shown mercy to him in the place* where he is. Arise, take the boy and hold him by the hand, for I will make a great nation of him." *The Lord* uncovered her eyes and a

[24] Maher, *Pseudo Jonathan*, 75.
[25] Ibid., 75–76.

> well of water *was revealed to her*, and she went and filled the water-skin with water, and gave the boy to drink. *The Memra of the Lord was at the assistance of* the boy, and he grew up. He dwelt in the wilderness and became a *skilled* bowman. He dwelt in the desert of Paran *and took as wife Adisha. But he divorced her*, and his mother took *Fatima* as wife for him from the land of Egypt. (*Tg. Ps.-J. Gen.* 21:17–21)[26]

4. The Dispute between Isaac and Ishmael

The last point, which I would like to present very briefly, is a development we find in the Aramaic translation of Gen 22:1. Hagar only appears indirectly, as the mother of Ishmael, in the long addition *Pseudo-Jonathan* makes to the first verse of the story of the Aqedah. However, in a famous article, Le Déaut[27] asserts that Gal 4:29–30 may be understood against the background of the haggadah contained in this verse of the *Pseudo-Jonathan*, in spite of the fact that there is no apparent similarity in the wording of the two texts.

The Hebrew text simply reads, "After these things God tested Abraham. He said to him, 'Abraham!' And he said, 'Here I am.'" The long addition in *Pseudo-Jonathan* focuses on an explanation of why God should have "tested Abraham."

> After these events, *after Isaac and Ishmael had quarrelled, Ishmael said, "It is right that I should be my father's heir, since I am his first-born son." But Isaac said, "It is right that I should be my father's heir, because I am the son of Sarah his wife, while you are the son of Hagar my mother's maidservant." Ishmael answered and said, "I am more worthy than you, because I was circumcised at the age of thirteen. And if I had wished to refuse, I would not have handed myself over to be circumcised. But you were circumcised at the age of eight days. If you had been aware perhaps you would not have handed yourself over to be circumcised."*[28] *Isaac answered and said, "Behold, today I am thirty-seven years old, and if the Holy One, blessed be He, were to ask all my members I would not refuse." These words were immediately heard before the Lord of the*

---

[26] Ibid., 76.

[27] R. Le Déaut, "Traditions targumiques dans le Corpus Paulinien? (Hebr 11, 4 et 12, 24; Gal 4, 29–30; II Cor 3, 16)," *Bib* 42 (1961): 37–43.

[28] Josephus (*A.J.* 1.214) preserves the same tradition: "Eight days later they promptly circumcised him; and from that time forward the Jewish practice has been to circumcise so many days after birth. The Arabs defer the ceremony to the thirteenth year, because Ishmael, the founder of the race, born of Abraham's concubine was circumcised at that age."

> *world, and at once the Memra of the Lord* tested Abraham and said to him "Abraham!" And he said *to him*, "Here I am." (*Tg. Ps.-J. Gen.* 22:1)[29]

The first claim by Ishmael is based on the right of the first-born, while Isaac's counter-claim is based on the fact that he is the son of Abraham's wife, whereas Ishmael is the son of the servant.[30] This claim is unparalleled in other Jewish texts, but seems to underline the argument in Galatians. The second argument relates more directly to the Aqedah and is the same as that brought forward by Josephus.[31] Ishmael defends his claim on the grounds that he freely accepted circumcision—he was thirteen years old (according to the biblical text, Gen 18:25) when Abraham circumcised him, and therefore he could have refused—while Isaac was a baby, circumcised at the age of eight days, and was therefore not free to refuse. Here Isaac replies that, as a fully-grown man,[32] he is now ready to offer not only his foreskin but all his limbs if it were asked of him. Isaac is thus ready for such a sacrifice and God decides to test Abraham "at once."

5. Conclusions

Targum Pseudo-Jonathan has preserved several traditions built around the figure of the maidservant of Sarah. With regard to Hagar's Egyptian origins, *Pseudo-Jonathan* makes her a daughter of the Pharaoh and a granddaughter of the Babylonian King Nimrod. The rationale for this strange genealogy is the fact that the Targum associates Hagar and Ishmael with idolatry. Moreover, according to the Targum Sarah hated Hagar because she was a descendant of the despised Nimrod who originally exiled Abraham and Sarah from their homeland. With regard to Hagar's status, *Pseudo-Jonathan* makes her a free woman in order to prevent Abraham from becoming the father of a slave's child. With regard to the description

---

[29] Maher, *Pseudo Jonathan*, 77–78.

[30] See n. 15 above.

[31] See n. 27 above.

[32] The majority of the rabbinic sources give his age as thirty-seven (*Gen. Rab.* 55:5; *b. Sanh.* 89b), but one of the manuscripts of the *Seder "Olam Rabba"* (Parma, Bibliotheca Palatina 2787), which is considered by C. J. Milikowski to represent the original, *Seder Olam: A Rabbinic Chronography* (Ph.D. diss., Yale University 1981), 53, gives Isaac's age as twenty-six. Josephus (*A.J.* 1.227) specifies that Isaac was twenty-five: "Isaac, therefore, who was now twenty-five years of age while constructing the altar, asked what sacrifice they were about to offer, having no victim."

of Ishmael, in *Pseudo-Jonathan* God accuses Ishmael of having abandoned the training Abraham gave him and more particularly of practising idolatry. Moreover, the positive promises of God to make a great people from the son of the servant are transformed in *Pseudo-Jonathan* into the promise to create from him a people of robbers.

D. RENAISSANCE RECEPTIONS OF 4 EZRA

CHAPTER TEN

THE AUTHORITY OF 4 EZRA AND THE DISCOVERY OF AMERICA

To José Manuel Sánchez Caro
On his seventieth birthday and on his retirement

José Manuel Sánchez Caro has repeatedly considered the problems of the authority and inspiration of Scripture and recently has written two important studies on the authority and inspiration of the Apocrypha, more specifically with respect to 4 Ezra.[1] For this reason, it seemed appropriate to display my friendship and appreciation with a couple of notes on this aprocryphal work, a text that for centuries was part of the Catholic Bible, the Vulgate.[2] However, the years after the discovery of America saw its authority strongly disputed, even though it had been an inspiration to Christopher Columbus in his American adventure, it had influenced biblical exegesis and Hebrew philology, and it had had a central position in the discussion about the Jewish origin of the American Indians.[3]

---

[1] J. M. Sánchez Caro, "Inspiración y canon en 4 Esd 14,1–50. Intento de revisión," *EstBíb* 64 (2006): 671–97 and idem, "Inspiración y canon en la literatura apócrifa veterotestamentaria: Etapas de un largo camino," *EstBíb* 66 (2008): 141–77, as well as many earlier studies on the problem of the canon, for example, "El canon de la Biblia," in *Biblia y Palabra de Dios* (ed. A. M. Artola and J. M. Sánchez Caro; IEB 2; Estella: Verbo Divino, 1990), 59–135.

[2] In the Vulgate, the apocryphal book of Ezra has the first two chapters, usually called Fifth Esdras, and the final chapters (15–16), usually called Sixth Esdras, which are clearly Christian in origin. 4 Ezra (chs. 3–14), which concerns us here, is Jewish in origin although both the Hebrew (or Aramaic) and its translation into Greek have been lost. The work has been preserved in Latin and Syriac as well as in Georgian, Ethiopic, Coptic, Arabic, and Armenian. For details, see M. E. Stone, *Fourth Ezra: A Commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 10–11.

[3] The influence of 4 Ezra on discussions about the Jewish origin of the Indians has been expertly discussed by F. Schmidt in his contribution "Arzareth en Amérique: L'autorité du *Quatrième Livre d'Esdras* dans la discussion sur la parenté des juifs et des Indiens d'Amérique (1530–1729)," in *Moïse géographe. Recherches sur les représentations juives et chrétiennes de l'espace* (ed. A. Desreumaux and F. Schmidt; Paris: Vrin, 1988), 155–201. I have also discussed this topic in respect of the 16th century in the volume in honour of José González Luis in *Fortunatae: Revista Canaria de Filología, Cultura y Humanidades Clásicas*, 2012, published in this volume as "The Authority of 4 Ezra and the Jewish Origin of (Native) American Indians."

1. The Authority of 4 Ezra in Spain

Before the Reformation, the authority of 4 Ezra had not been particularly disputed in Spain. In manuscripts of the Vulgate, 4 Ezra, usually placed between Nehemiah and Tobit, appears among inspired writings about whose authority there was absolutely no doubt.[4]

The opinions of the Church Fathers are divided on this issue: some of them know 4 Ezra and quote it, while others have reservations about its authority.[5] Among those who recognise its authority are Clement of Alexandria,[6] who cites 4 Ezra 5:35 verbatim with the formula: "The Prophet Ezra says."[7] The most decided on his authority is Ambrose of Milan, who uses him and quotes him very often:[8] in his *De bono Mortis*[9] he refers explicitly ("Siquidem et in Hesdrae libris legimus") to 4 Ezra 7:32–33;[10] 7:36–42;[11] 7:80–87;[12] 7:91–101,[13] and 14:9,[14] concluding: "Who came first, Ezra or Plato? For Paul had followed the sayings of Ezra, not of Plato, since Ezra revealed, according to the revelation received: the just will be

---

[4] T. Ayuso Marazuela, *La Vetus Latina Hispana: Prolegomenos* (Madrid: CSIC, 1953), 345–99: "Los manuscripts bíblicos españoles" and J. Cantera Ortiz de Urbina, *La Biblia en los códices de España* (Madrid: BAC, 1973), as well as the earlier but still fundamental study by D. De Bruyne, "Études sur les origines de la Vulgate en Espagne," *RBén* 31 (1914–19): 373–401.

[5] The collection of patristic quotations was made by M. R. James, in his introduction to the posthumous edition by R. L. Bensley, *The Fourth Book of Ezra* (TS 3.2; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1895), xxvii–xliii, and by B. Violet, *Die Esra-Apokalypse* (*IV Esra*), *Band 1: Die Überlieferung* (GCS 18; Leipzig: Heinrichs, 1910), xliv–l. A good summary presentation of the data can be found in the first chapter ("From the Church Fathers to the Renaissance") of the book by A. Hamilton, *The Apocryphal Apocalypse: The Reception of the Second Book of Ezra* (*4 Ezra*) *from the Renaissance to the Enlightenment* (Oxford-Warburg Studies; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999), 21–29.

[6] The four recognised quotations from Clement of Alexandria and from the *Apostolic Constitutions* are conveniently available in A.-M. Denis, *Fragmenta Pseudepigraphorum quae supersunt Graeca una cum Historicorum Auctorum Judaeorum Hellenistarum Fragmentis* (PVTG 3; Leiden: Brill, 1970), 130–32.

[7] Ἔσδρας ὁ προφήτης λέγει, *Strom.* 3.16.

[8] A. F. J. Klijn, *Der lateinische Text der Apokalypse des Esra* (TUGAL 131; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1983), 93–97 conveniently published all the Latin quotations from 4 Ezra following the CSEL editions.

[9] There is a new edition of the *De bono mortis* with a detailed analysis of the use Ambrose makes of 4 Ezra: W. T. Wiesner, *S. Ambrosii De bono mortis: A Revised Text with an Introduction, Translation and Commentary* (CUAPS 100; Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1970), 238–56.

[10] *De bono Mortis*, 10.45

[11] Ibid., 12.53.

[12] Ibid., 10.47.

[13] Ibid., 11.48.

[14] Ibid., 11.50.

with Christ and the saints."[15] In his *De Spiritu Sancto*,[16] he quotes 4 Ezra 6:41: "Quia creatur spiritus Hesdras nos docuit, dicens in tertio libro: *Et in die secundo iterum creasti spiritum firmamenti*," and in *De excessu Satyri*, he repeatedly refers to the book as "Scripture" ("Sed iam audiamus quae scripta sunt . . . Sed ecce dicentem scripturam audio") clearly referring to 4 Ezra 10:6–24.[17]

Other Fathers are less enthusiastic. Jerome, faithful to his "Hebraica veritas," considers it to be an apocryphal book, for which he has no devotion, even though he included in his Vulgate a translation of most of the book from the Greek. In his dispute with the Priscillianist Vigilancio (who, although born in Aquitaine, spent most of his life as a presbyter in Barcelona), he presumes not to read it: "You sleep while awake and you write while sleeping; you propose to me an apocryphal book which under the name of Ezra, is read by you and yours: there it is written that after death no-one should pray for anyone.[18] What need is there to take in one's hands what the Church does not accept?"[19] In the preface to the canonical book of Ezra he makes his thoughts quite clear: in Hebrew there is only one book of Ezra and Nehemiah, and what is not in Hebrew does not count.[20]

In Spain, everything indicates that Ambrose's positive opinion had more weight than Jerome's negative opinion. The earliest quotation from 4 Ezra (14:33) which is clearly connected with Spain, occurs in the third treatise by Priscillian, the Bishop of Ávila, who not only knows the book but considers it, while not canonical, of very high authority:

> Quae si vera incensa et vere credimus fuisse rescribta, quamvis incensum testamentum legatur in canone, rescribtum ab Hesdra in canone non legitur, tamen, quia post incensum testamentum reddi non potuit nisi fuisset scribtum, recte illi libro fidem damus, qui Hesdra auctore prolatus, etsi in

---

[15] "Quis utique prior, Hesdra an Plato? Nam Paulus Hesdrae, non Platonis, secutus est dicta. Hesdras enim revelauit secundum colatam in se revelationem, iustos cum Christo futuros et cum sanctis." *De bono Mortis.* In all the Latin quotations I have modernised the spelling to make reading easier.

[16] *De Spiritu Sancto*, 2.6.

[17] *De excessu Satyri*, 1.2.

[18] Jerome seems to allude to 4 Ezra 7:36–45.

[19] "Tu vigilans dormis, et dormiens scribis: et proponis mihi librum apocryphum, qui sub nomine Esdrae a te et similibus tuis legitur: ubi scriptum est, quod post mortem nullus pro aliis audeat deprecari: quem ego librum nunquam legi. Quid enim necesse est in manus sumere, quod Ecclesia non recipit?" *Contra Vigilantium*, 344–45.

[20] "Nec quemquam moveat, quod unus a nobis liber editus est, nec apocriforum tertii et quarti libri somniis delectetur, quia et apud Hebraeos Esdrae Nehemiaque sermones in unum volumen coartantur; et quae non habentur apud illos, nec de viginti quattuor senibus sunt, procul abicenda." *Prologus in librum Esdre.*

> canone non ponitur, ad elogium redditi divini testamenti digna rerum veneratione retinetur; in quo tamen legimus scriptum spiritum sanctum ab initio seculi et hominum et rerum gesta retinentem cor electi hominis intrasse et, quod vix ad humanam memoriam scribti forma retineret ordine numero ratione repetita, cum *per diem loquens et nocte non tacens* scriberet, omnia quae gesta videntur esse vel legimus scribta ad humanam memoriam condidisse.[21]

According to the introduction by Montague Rhodes James to Bensley's edition: "It is quite possible that to Priscilian may be due the existence of the Spanish texts of 4 Esdras,"[22] an opinion also proposed by D. De Bruyne, who, after stating that all the Latin manuscripts of 4 Ezra seem to come from Spain, directly or indirectly, wonders whether the work had been transmitted through Priscillianist circles.[23] In any case, Priscillian's influence is evident in the principal Spanish biblical manuscripts, which transmit the so-called "canons of Priscillian," a compendium of Pauline theology, whether corrected or not by Peregrino.[24] Similarly, Vigilancio's interest in 4 Ezra, as shown by Jerome's attacks, is a clear indication of the importance and authority of the apocryphon in Spain at the beginning of the fifth century.

This authority did not diminish over time. In the seventh century, Isidore of Seville, whose influence would be considerable, seems to attribute to 4 Ezra an authority like that of Moses,[25] and we cannot forget that a large number of manuscripts transmit, at the head of each book of the Prophets, the *argumentum beati Isidorii de ortu et abitu ejusdem prophetae.*

Although not all mediaeval Latin bibles include 4 Ezra, it is found in most Spanish manuscripts.[26] Thus in the 1162 copy, in three volumes, of

---

[21] *Tractatus III. De fide et apocryphis* (CSEL 67:52).

[22] *The Fourth Book of Ezra*, xxxvi.

[23] D. De Bruyne, "Quelques nouveaux documents pour la critique textuelle de l'Apocalypse d'Esdras," *RBén* 32 (1920): 43–47: "Est-il téméraire de soupçonner que cet écrit nous a été transmis par les milieux priscilianiste d'Espagne?"

[24] S. Berger, *Histoire de la Vulgate pendant les premiers siècles du Moyen Age* (Paris: Hachette, 1893), 26–28.

[25] "Esdras sacrae scriptor historiae actque lator legis post Moysen." *De vita et morte sanctorum*, LXI.

[26] Although not in Catalan bibles, see A. Puig i Tàrrech, *La biblia a Catalunya, Valencia i les illes fine al segle XV* (Tarragona: Institut superior de ciences religioses Santo Fructuos, 1997). The bible in the National Library of Paris, *Lat. 6*, in four volumes, from the Abbey of Rosas, copied in the 15th century and known as the bible of Noailles, contains only "Ezra's confession" (4 Ezra 8:20–36); immediately after the book of Esther there is the following colophon: "Hucusque completum est vetus testamentum id est omnes cannonicas scripturas. Quod fiunt libri XXti.IIIIor. quas transtuli ego hieronimus presbiter de haebraica veritate. Et in latinum eos verti sermonem. Summo studio. Summaque cura per diversos

Codex Legionensis of 960,[27] in the first Alcalá bible (Codex Complutensis 1 or Codex 31 from the library of the University of Madrid, of which now only the photograph copy from the abbey of St. Jerome in Rome has been preserved),[28] or in the great bible of Ávila,[29] to mention some of the more typical examples. In any case, Spanish codices enabled the lost fragment of ch. 7 (69 verses between 7:35 and 36) to be recovered.[30]

Another indication of the authority that 4 Ezra had in Spain is the Spanish origin of most of the Codices of the Latin version of 4 Ezra preserved.[31] Similarly, the fact that 4 Ezra has deeply influenced the Mozarabic liturgy and not only in the *Liber Canticorum* which includes the "Confession of Ezra" (8:20–36),[32] but also in the *Antifonario Visigótico Mozárabe*, which includes quotations from various parts of the book.[33] Instead, in the Roman liturgy, the quotations chiefly come from ch. 2, or Fifth Ezra.[34]

In view of the authority that 4 Ezra had in Spain, I find it surprising that it is missing from the great edition by Cardinal Cisneros, published

---

codices oberrans aediciones perquisvi. Et in unum collexi corpus. Et scribens transfudi. Fecique pandectem." Berger, *Histoire de la Vulgate*, 24–25.

[27] Berger, *Histoire de la Vulgate*, 21: "Le tome III commence avec le livre de Tobie. Ce qui donne à notre manuscrit un intérêt particulier, c'est qu'après le *prologus beati Hysidori Spaliensis episcopi in libro sedeca prophetarum* et après diverses pièces, on lit à la fin un texte du IV^e^ livre d'Ezra, inconnu jusqu'à présent, différent de tous ceux que nous connaissons et qui est absolument étranger au manuscrit original de San-Isidro, au *Codex gothicus Legionensis*."

[28] Ibid., 22*:* "On lit, après les livres canoniques d'Esdras et de Néhémie, le 'III^e^ et IV^e^ livre d'Esdras,' c'est-à-dire en réalité le IVe, dans un texte à part, avec quelques variantes en marge."

[29] Ibid., 23–24: "Il ne sera pas sans intérêt d'ajouter que la grande et belle bible d'Avila, écrite au commencement du XIII^e^ siècle, et qui est conservée à la bibliothèque nationale de Madrid (E.R.8), contient, au milieu d'un texte tout différent, le IV^e^ livre d'Esdras, dans un texte entièrement semblable à celui du manuscrit d'Alcalá, et paraissant copié sur lui."

[30] R. L. Bensley, *The Missing Fragment of the Latin Translation of the Fourth Book of Ezra* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1875).

[31] And not only Spanish manuscripts, such as the Palimpsest Codex from the Collegiate church in León, or the Complutensis, Abulensis or Legionensis codices. See the detailed descriptions in Klijn, *Der lateinische Text*, 13–17.

[32] On the *Liber Canticorum*, see Ayuso Marazuela, *La Vetus Latina Hispana*, 450–52, and for more detail, J. M. Pinell, "El Oficio Hispano-Visigótico," *Hispania Sacra* 10 (1957): 385–427.

[33] See L. Brou and J. Vives, *Antifonario Visigótico Mozarábe de la Catedral de León* (Monumenta Hispaniae Sacra 5.1: Barcelona: CSIC, 1959), and for more detail L. Brou, "Le IV^e^ Livre d'Esdras dans la Liturgie Hispanique et le Graduel Romain *Locus iste* de la messe de la Dédicace," *SacEr* 9 (1957): 75–109.

[34] "Requiem eternam dona eis domine et lux perpetua luceat eis" (2.34–35), "Accipite jucinditatem gloriae vestrae, alleluia: gratias agentes Deo, alleluia: qui vos coelestia regna vocavit, alleluia" (2.36–37), "ideo coronati possidunt palman" (2.45).

between 1514 and 1517, even though 4 Ezra is in the Codex Complutensis, acquired by Cisneros and used in the Polyglot edition. It is difficult to imagine the reason for this omission (to which I have found no reference at all in the various prefaces), apart from the lack of a Hebrew or Greek original, since other Greek extra-canonical books (such as the Prayer of Manasseh) are included in their traditional position and have both the Latin translation of Jerome and the interlinear Latin version.[35] This omission from the Complutensian Polyglot contrasts strongly with the inclusion of 4 Ezra in the Antwerp Polyglot, published between 1569 and 1572, i.e., after the Council of Trent, in which 4 Ezra is printed in its traditional position. It can be explained, I think, as shall see below, by the influence that the discovery of America had on Arias Montano, the author of the Antwerp Polyglot.

The decision not to include 4 Ezra among the canonical books,[36] made in the fourth session of the Council of Trent, on the 8th of April 1548, would finally cause it to lose its traditional position between the books of Nehemiah and Tobit, which was where it appeared in mediaeval manuscripts, by relegating it to an appendix, which would result in its increasing loss of authority. However, this did not happen immediately, either in the Catholic world,[37] or in the Protestant world.[38] Instead it would be the result of a lengthy process throughout the 16th century. As Bogaert and Gilmont indicate,[39] Catholic tradition, both in Latin bibles and in bibles translated into vernacular languages (as in the Bible of Lefévre d'Etaples dated 1530 and 1534, or in the first Bible of Leuven in 1550), included

---

[35] In the *Prologus ad lectorem* of the same Complutensian Polyglot, which is repeated in the four volumes on the Old Testament, after stating that the Targum printed there is restricted to the Pentateuch, because in the Targumim of the other books "corrupta est aliquibus in locis: et fabulis merifices Thalmudistarum nugis conspersa: indigna prorsus quae sacris codicibus inferatur" (although they had been edited, translated into Latin and deposited in *Biblioteca de la Universidad Complutense*), it says in respect of the extra-canonical books in Greek: "At vero libri extra cononem: quos Ecclesia potius ad aedificationem populi: ad autoritatem ecclesiasticorum dogmatum confirmandam recipit: Graecam tn. habent scripturam: sed cum duplici latina interpretatione: altera beati Hyeronymi: altera interlineari de verbo ad verbo: eo modo quo in caeteris."

[36] In spite of the opposition of some council fathers, such as Antonio de la Cruz, Bishop of the Canaries, who objects: "Placent decreta, Unum tamen addam, ne libri Esdrae deleantur de suo loco," in *Concilium Tridentinum: Diariorum, Actorum, Epistularum, Tractatum: Nova Collectio* (ed. S. Merkle; Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1901–1938), 5:87.

[37] See chapter 5 of Hamilton, *The Apocryphal Apocalypse*, 94–104: "Catholic Responses."

[38] Ibid., 65–93: "Official Attitudes."

[39] P. M. Bogaert and J. F. Gilmont, "La première Bible française de Louvain (1550)," *RTL* 11 (1980): 275–309.

4 Ezra in its traditional position.[40] Instead, Protestant tradition after 1535 grouped the apocrypha (including 4 Ezra) in a special section between the Old and New Testaments.[41] However, there are clear exceptions. To cite a single example connected with Spain, the Bible of the Bear by Casiodoro de la Reina (printed in Basle in 1569) places the translation of 4 Ezra in its traditional position in the Vulgate, after Ezra-Nehemiah, as was the current practice in Spain, and does not relegate it to a special section as was customary in the Protestant world.

Instead, the "Sixtine" edition of the Vulgate of 1590, omits 4 Ezra completely,[42] possibly under the influence of the writings of Sixtus of Siena and of Robert Bellarmine.

In 1566, Sixtus of Siena had published his *Bibliotheca Sancta*.[43] In the third section of the first book ("De Scripturis Apocryphis Divinae Scripturae Inseritis"), after defining the two meanings of the word "apocrypha" (books of uncertain authorship or non-canonical books),[44] summarises on pages 33–36 the arguments for classifying 4 Ezra as an apocryphal book:

---

[40] Ibid., 301: "Les Bibles médiévales . . . copient ces livres à leur place traditionnelle . . . Le même usage se retrouve dans les traductions françaises depuis le XIII[e] siècle . . . C'est l'usage catholique jusqu'à ce que, pour la première fois, la Sixto-Clémentine de 1592 relègue en fin de volume les livres non reconnus canoniques à Trente."

[41] Ibid., 301: "Depuis 1535, toutes les Bibles réformées regroupent les « Apocryhes » entre l'Ancien et le Nouveau Testament. Elles mettent ainsi un terme, à leur manière, à la contradiction entre les préfaces hiéronymiens et le texte des Bibles médiévales. La section des Apocryphes comporte toujours *III* et *IV Esdras* et la *Prière de Manassé*. Elle est souvent précédée d'une préface signifiant leur moindre valeur."

[42] *Biblia Sacra Vulgatae Editionis ad Concilii Tridentini prescriptum emendata et a Sixto V P.M. recognita et approbata*, Roma: ex typographia Apostolica Vaticana, 1590.

[43] This work enjoyed great popularity from its publication in 1566 and was frequently reprinted. In the Maurits Sabbe library of the Theological Faculty of Leuven there are copies of the editions dated 1574–1575 ("apud Francisci Senensen"), 1575 ("ex officina typographica Nicolai Bassaei"), 1576 ("Apud Maternum Cholinum"), 1586 ("Apud Maternum Cholinun") and 1610 ("ex typographia Rolini Theodorici"). *The Digital Library of the Catholic Reformation* contains an edition from 1626 ("Ex officinal Choliniana, Sumptibus Petri Cholini") which is the one I quote from here.

[44] *Bibliotheca Sancta*, 2. "Apocryphae autem, id est, absconditae, occultae, vel dubiae scripturae, duobus modis dicuntur, vel quia ipsarum autor incertus est, quo sanè modo contingere potest etiam aliquos ex Canonicis libris esse Apocryphos; quia non omnino Ecclesiae certum est, & compertum, quis hominum fuerit illorum scriptor; cùm tamen ipsa certissimè credat illorum autorem fuisse Spiritum sanctum. Vel alia ratione dicuntur Apocryphae, hoc est absconditae, ignotae, incertarae, & obscurae autoritatis, quia non certè sciverint, nec definire auserint ecclesiastici Patres, an essent à scriptoribus suis afflatu Spiritus sancti conscriptae: & ob id noluerunt eas vel ad confirmationem dogmatum Christianae fidei proferri, vel ad plebis aedificationem publicè in Ecclesia legi, & in templis pronunciari, sed privatim, & domi tantùm legi permiserunt. tales sunt tertius & quartus Esdrae libri."

there is no Hebrew or Greek original,[45] Jerome labels it not only as of uncertain authorship but even of doubtful authority,[46] most of the Holy Fathers reject it, and it contains suspect statements that seem to contradict healthy orthodoxy,[47] a point that Sixtus of Siena analyses in detail, with examples from chapters 4, 6 and 14.

The ideas of Sixtus of Siena would deeply influence Robert Bellarmine, a professor in the Jesuit College in Leuven from 1570 to 1576, before he occupied the chair of controversy in the Roman College. In 1586,[48] the first edition of his *Disputationes de Controversiis Christianae Fidei Adversus Hujus Temporis Haereticos*, dedicated to Sixtus V, appeared.[49] In the first volume, the first book of the first controversy, *De Verbo Dei Scripto et non Scripto*, Bellarmine resumes the arguments of Sixtus of Siena: even though cited by Ambrose, it is not canonical since no council includes it in the canon; there is no Hebrew or Greek version, and it contains rabbinic fables such as those about Leviathan.[50]

---

[45] Ibid., 34: "Quartus verò liber, complectens visiones & nocturna potissimum somnia ipsius Esdrae, nec apud Graecos, nec apud Hebraeos est."

[46] Ibid., 34: "Hieronymus in Praesatione eiusdem operis, utrumque inter Apocrypha tam obscuri Autoris, quàm incertae autoritatis scripta reiicit, & quae in eis narrantur, somnia vocat."

[47] Ibid., 35: "Ex horum itaque testium ac testimoniorum authoritate accidisse arbitror, ut divinis Scripturis coniungeretur liber hic, quem postea diligentius perspectum, communis ferè omnium patrum consensus, inter Apocryphos habendum censuit, idque, ut puto, propter quaedam suspecta dogmata in ipso tradita, quae regulis orthodoxae fidei apertè contradicere videntur."

[48] Although, as stated in the Preface, the disputes were held in the Collegio Romano in 1576, during the first years of his stay in Rome.

[49] In *The Digital Library of Catholic Reformation* there is an electronic version of the Inglostat version from 1588 which is the one I cite here.

[50] *Disputationes*, 79: "Postremò apocryphi sunt, liber tertius & quartus Machabaeorum, necnon tertius & quartus Esdrae. Et quidem de quarto Machabaeorum res perspicua est, cùm solùm nominetur ab Athanasio in synopsi, & ab eodem extra canonem ponatur. Quartus autem Esdrae citatur quidem ab Ambrosio libro de bono mortis, & lib. 2. in Lucam, ac in epistola 21. ad Horatianum: tamen sine dubio non est canonicus, cùm à nullo Concilio referatur in canonem, & non inveniatur neque Hebraicè, neque Graecè, ac demùm contineat cap. 6. quaedam fabulosa de pisce Henoch & Leviatham, quos maria capere non poterant, quae Rabinorum Talmudistarum somnia sunt. Itaque mirandum est, quid Genebrardo venerit in mentem, ut hunc etiam librum ad canonem pertinere vellet, in Chronologia sua, pag. 90." Bellarmine refers to the book by Gilbert Genebrard, professor of Hebrew in the Royal College of Paris and archbishop of Aix, which he had published in 1567 his *Chronographiae libri quatuor*, a work that had great influence and was frequently re-published, and in which he defended the traditional (anti-Tridentine) position about the authority of 4 Ezra with an original argument: 4 Ezra is not in the first canon of scripture because it had not yet been written, but it is in the second which is larger: "Tertius et quartus Ezrae, qui nominatur, non sunt de priore canone Hebraeorum, quia nondum

As a result, 4 Ezra is one of those books that some considered as authoritative, but which has never been approved by the Church.[51]

Whatever the motives might have been for the omission of 4 Ezra from the Sixtine Vulgate, in the edition of the Clementine Vulgate of 1592, in which the decrees of the Council of Trent finally materialised, 4 Ezra would definitively be relegated to an appendix.[52] In the "Praefacio ad lectorem," this edition by Clement VIII of the Vulgate is presented as putting into effect what Sixtus V had really wished to achieve: "opus, in quod Sixtus V intenderat, Deo bene juvante perfectum est." There it explains that the 1590 edition had been considered defective by Sixtus V himself, and that the rapid changes in the papacy after his death had delayed its correction.

Once relegated to an appendix and classified as an apocryphal book, towards the end of the 16th century the authority of 4 Ezra would diminish conspicuously, even in Spain, where during the previous centuries it had enjoyed the same authority as the other inspired books. It will become clear that in the 15th century, 4 Ezra enjoyed great authority in Spain, as we are about to see, due to the influence that book had on the discovery of America.

---

erant editi, quando Canon iste sancitus est in hac magna Synodo, cuius fuit Ezra scriba, et cuius meminere lolemniter omnes Hebraei. At non definunt esse sacri et canonici, quoniam haec Synodus non obligabat consecutus auctores factos, nec spiritus sancti afflatum extinguebat vel contrahebat, propter quos editus est alte Canon multo amplior, ut significat Ioseph, lib. 2. Contra Appionem, quando citat versum Ecclesiastici libro tanquam scriptura sacra." I quote the edition of 1580: Gilb. Genebradi Theologi Parisiensis Divinarum Hebraicarumque Literarum Professoris Regii *Chonographiae libri quatuor*, Parisiis, apud Aegidium Garbinum, 1580, 90.

[51] *Disputationes*, 13: "Postremò de iis, qui quamquam à nonnullis clarissimis doctissimisque viris aliquando in numero divinorum voluminum haberentur; publico tamen totius Ecclesiae iudicio nunquam approbati sunt."

[52] In his "Praefacio ad lectorem," the 1592 edition explains the position given to 4 Ezra as follows: "Porro in hac editione nihil non canonicum, nihil ascititium, nihil extraneum apponere visum est: atque ea causa fuit, cur liber tertius et quartus Esdræ inscripti, quos inter canonicos libros sacra Tridentina Synodus non annumeravit, ipsa etiam Manassæ regis Oratio, quæ neque hebraice, neque græce quidem exstat, neque in manuscriptis antiquioribus invenitur, neque pars est ullius canonici libri, extra canonicæ Scripturæ seriem posita sint: et nullæ ad marginem concordantiæ (quæ posthac inibi apponi non prohibentur), nullæ notæ, nullæ variæ lectiones, nullæ denique præfationes, nulla argumenta ad librorum initia conspiciantur."

2. 4 Ezra and Christopher Columbus

In the introduction to the Spanish translation of 4 Ezra by Domingo Muñoz León, we can read in note 131: "Apart from the influence on the liturgy for the dead in the Roman Missal, Metzger recalls that a passage from 'Prophet Ezra' was decisive in making Christopher Columbus set off on his voyage to discover America. The passage in question is 6:42, concerning the distribution of the land and the sea."[53] To this passage (6:42) we can add 6:47–48, which repeats the essential statement: the world is composed of six parts earth and only one of water:

> et tertio die imperasti aquis congregari in septima parte terrae, sex vero partes siccasti et conservasti, ut ex his sint coram te ministrantia seminata adeo et culta. (6:42)
>
> quinto autem die dixisti septimae parti ubi erat aqua congregata, ut procrearet animalia, volatilia et pisces, et ita fiebat aqua muta et sine anima, quod ei iubebatur, animalia faciens, ut ex hoc mirabilia tua nationes enarrent. (6:47–48)[54]

In Michael Stone's translation:

> On the third day thou didst command the waters to be gathered together in the seventh part of the earth; six parts thou didst dry up and keep so that some of them might be planted and cultivated and be of service before thee. (6:42)
>
> But on the fifth day thou didst command the seventh part, where the water had been gathered together, to bring forth living creatures, birds, and fishes; and so it was done. The dumb and lifeless water produced living creatures that therefore the nations might declare thy wondrous works. (6:47–48)[55]

---

[53] D. Muñoz León, "Libro IV de Esdras," in *Apócrifos del Antiguo Testamento VI* (ed. A. Díez Macho and A. Piñero; Madrid: Cristiandad, 2009).

[54] According to the edition by R. Weber, in the *Biblia Sacra Iuxta Vulgatam versionem* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1983).

[55] Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 178. The translation by G. Marcelo Nápole, *Liber Ezrae Quartus: Estudio de la obra, tradución crítica y notas exegéticas a partir de la versión latina* (Valencia: Facultad de Teología San Vicente Ferrer, 1998), 124 is very similar: "Y al tercer día ordenaste a las aguas que se congregaran en la séptima parte de la tierra; y Tú secaste y conservaste seis partes para que ellas sirvieran ante ti y fueran en verdad sembradas y cultivadas (6:42) Pero al quinto día tú has dicho a la séptima parte donde estaba congregada el agua, que produjera seres vivientes, pájaros y peces. Y de este modo, el agua muda y sin alma hacía lo que le fue ordenado produciendo seres vivientes, para que las naciones narren tus maravillas (6:47–48)."

The text is umambiguous and absolutely clear: there are six parts of land and only one of water. But this clearly contradicts what had been common opinion since antiquity. Ptolemy, for example, considers that the ocean covers most of the earth, of which only a sixth is habitable. The different ratio of earth and water in 4 Ezra in relation to the generally accepted proportions would be a decisive influence on launching the American adventure, since Christopher Columbus knew it and used it as an argument.

Already in the 13th century, Roger Bacon, the Franciscan *Doctor mirabilis*, in his *Opus majus*,[56] had clearly set out the different opinions of Ptolemy on the one hand,[57] and of Aristotle and Seneca on the other,[58] concluding that the distance between Spain and the Indies could not be that great.[59] Bacon considers that Aristotle and Seneca were better informed than Ptolemy: Aristotle, through Alexander the Great's explorations and the information he supplied;[60] Seneca from his research undertaken on the orders of Nero.[61] But for Bacon the most important argument that makes him reach his conclusion is the evidence from 4 Ezra. Although considered apocryphal by some, for him it had the highest authority.[62]

---

[56] I use the edition by J. H. Bridges, *The* Opus majus *of Roger Bacon* (Oxford: Williams and Northgate, 1900).

[57] *Opus majus*, 290: "Alio modo consideratur quantitas habitabilis respectu aquae, scilicet, quantum aqua impediat. Et hoc est modo considerandum. Ptolemaeus vero in libro de Dispositione Sphaerae vult quod fere sexta pars terrae est habitabilis propter aquam, et totum residuum est coopertum aqua."

[58] Ibid., 290: "Sed Aristoteles vult in fine secundi Coeli et Mundi quod plus habitetur quam quarta. Et Averroes hoc confirmat. Dicit Aristoteles quod mare parvum est inter finem Hispaniae a parte occidentis et inter principium Indiae a parte orientis."

[59] Ibid., 291: "A fine Hispaniae sub terra tam parvum mare est quod non potest cooperire tres quartas terrae."

[60] Ibid., 291: "Et propterhoc dico quod licet habitatio nota Ptolemaeo et ejus sequacibus sit coarctata infra quartam unam, plus tamen est habitabile. Et Aristoteles potuit plus nosse, quia auctoritate Alexandri misit duo millia hominum ad investigandum res hujus mundi, sicut Plinius dicit octavo Naturalium. Et ipsemet Alexander perambulavit usque ad finem orientis, et sicut patet ex historia Alexandri et ex epistolis quas Aristoteli conscripsit, semper mandavit ei de omnibus mirabilibus et insolitis quae inveniebat in oriente. Et ideo potuit Aristoteles plus certificare quam Ptolemaeus."

[61] Ibid., 291: "Et Seneca similiter; quia Nero imperator discipulus ejus similiter misit ut exploraret dubia hujus mundi, sicut Seneca narrat in Naturalibus."

[62] Ibid., 291: "Et hoc per auctoritatem alterius considerationis probatur. Nam Esdras dicit quarto libro, quod sex partes terrae sunt habitatae et septima est cooperta aquis. Et ne aliquis impediat hanc auctoritatem dicens quod liber ille est apocryphus et ignotae auctoritatis, dicendum est quod sancti habuerunt illum librum in usu et confirmant veritates sacras per illum librum. Et pluries in ofiicio divino utuntur auctoritatibus illius libri. Et ideo, sive Esdras sive alius hunc fecerit, supponendus est pro auctoritate."

Bacon's conclusion is absolutely clear: habitable land is extensive, much greater than what is covered by water.[63]

There is absolutely no indication that Columbus could have known the writings of the professor from Oxford. The text, edited by Samuel Jebb from an incomplete manuscript from Trinity College, Cambridge, was first printed by William Browyer in London in 1733. But John Henry Bridges, the editor of the edition of the *Opus majus* that I have used, indicates in a note to the passage quoted that the work *Ymago mundi* by Cardinal Pierre d'Ailly depends on the work by Bacon, whom he simply copied:

> This paragraph, including half of that which follows, has a remarkable history. It is inserted without acknowledgement of its source in *the Imago Mundi* of Cardinal d'Ailly (Petrus Aliacus), who died 1425, and whose work was printed at Louvain, 1480. It forms the greater part of the eighth chapter, entitled, 'De quantitate terrae habitabilis.' From this work it was quoted by Columbus in a letter written in October 1498 to Ferdinand and Isabella from Hispaniola.[64]

Cardinal d'Ailly, bishop of Courtrai, had intended to include the knowledge of his time in his work *Ymago mundi*, without troubling himself too much in identifying the sources from which he took his knowledge. He was simply attempting, as he explains in the prologue "To collect together, concisely and accurately, what wise men had written extensively about the matter."[65] The effort he put into this compilation make his cosmographic treatises a perfect summary of the knowledge of the period and clearly validates the authority of 4 Ezra in the 14th and 15th centuries. In chapter 7 of his *Ymago mundi*, d'Ailly deals, in effect, with these different opinions about habitable land ("De varietate opinionum circa habitationem terre") and in chapter 8 he deals with the amount of habitable land ("De quantitate terre habitabilis"). It is in this chapter in which the opinions of Roger Bacon are repeated almost verbatim, both with respect

---

[63] Ibid., 291: "Et ideo secundum haec quantitas habitabilis magna est et quod aqua cooperitur modicum debet esse."

[64] Bridges, *The* Opus majus *of Roger Bacon*, 290.

[65] "Ymago mundi seu eius ymaginaria descriptio. Ipsum velut in materiali quodam speculo representnts non parvum utilis esse videtur ad divinarum elucidationem scripturarum. Cum in eis de partibus ipsius et maxime de locis terre habitabilis mentio sepius habeatur. Ideo tractatum hunc scribere et in eo que a sapientibus super hec materia diffuse scripta sunt breviter ac veraciter colligere dignum duxi." I used the edition printed in Louvain by J. De Paderborn in 1483, which has been made accessible as pdf file on http://gallica.bnf.fr.

to the opinions of the ancients such as Ptolemy[66] and Aristotle,[67] and in the arguments that give Aristotle more credibility than Ptolemy,[68] and especially with respect to the authority of 4 Ezra.[69]

It is absolutely certain that Columbus was fully conversant with the work by Cardinal d'Ailly, as Louis Salembier showed in a series of three articles published in 1912 on the influence of the bishop of Cambrai on the discovery of America.[70] Salembier devotes the third section of his first article in collecting the proofs that Columbus knows and uses *Ymago mundi* repeatedly. The most important of his arguments is that Columbus himself, in the text that he sent to the Catholic Monarchs from the Española in 1498 ("Account of the third voyage") cites almost in full the eighth chapter of the work by d'Ailly, and states that he considers himself fortunate to have been able, by his voyages, to prove the work by Cardinal of Cambrai to be well-founded.[71] Bartolomé de las Casas, in his *Historia de las Indias*, relates how Columbus turned to the Catholic Monarchs, basing himself on the authority of 4 Ezra:

> I am of the belief that this is *terra firma*, enormous, which was not known about until today, and reason helps me considerably for such a great river as this, this sea, which is sweet, and then I am helped by the saying in Ezra, in the 4th book, chap. 6, who says that the six parts of the world are of dry earth and one is of water.[72]

It is important to determine exactly when Columbus came to know of the treatise by the Bishop of Cambrai. Before the discovery in 1492 or after?

---

[66] *Ymago mundi*, 27: "Nam Ptholome libro de dispositione spere. Vult quae fere sexta pars terre est habitabilis propter aquam. Totum residuum est copertus aquam."

[67] Ibid., 27: "Sed Aristotiles in fine libri celi et mundi vult quae pl. habitet quam quarta. Et Averroys hoc confirmat. Et dicit Aristotilis que mare parvum est inter finem Hyspanie a parte occidentis et inter principium Indie a parte orientis."

[68] Ibid., 27: "Et Aristotile circa hoc plus potuit nosse auxilio Alexandri. Et Seneca auxilio Neronis. Qui ad investigandum dubia huius mundi fuerunt sollicit."

[69] Ibid., 27: "Accedit ad hoc auctoritas Esdre libro suo quarto. dicentis quae sex partes terre sunt habitate et septima est coperta aquis. cuius libro auctoritatem sancti habuerunt in reverentia et veritates sacras per eum confirmarunt."

[70] L. Salembier, "Pierre d'Ailly et la découverte de l'Amérique," *RHEF* 3 (1912): 377–96; 516–33; 617–30. These articles have recently (2009) been collected in a book and published in BiblioBazar. I cite the original edition.

[71] Salembier, "Pierre d'Ailly," 394.

[72] Bartolomé de las Casas, *Historia de las Indias*, in *Obras escogidas* (Biblioteca de Autores Españoles; Madrid, Real Academia Española, 1957), 1:369. (Yo estoy creído que ésta es tierra firme, grandísima, de que hasta hoy no se ha sabido, y la razón me ayuda grandemente por esto deste tan grande río y desta mar, que es dulce, y después me ayuda el decir de Ezra, in el 4º libro, cap. 6, que dice que las seis partes del mundo son de tierra enjuta y la una de agua.)

Salembier clearly asks himself this question,[73] and opts for the second possibility: Columbus had read and annotated *Ymago mundi*, after the discovery.[74] But to be able to defend this position, Salembier is obliged not only to deny the contrary evidence from Columbus's *Diary* and the explicit statements by Bartolomé de las Casas, who had direct access to the discoverer's documents, but to suppose that Columbus himself knowingly altered these documents, revising his work, changing the *Diary a posteriori* and inserting later ideas into it.[75] This seems highly unlikely to me.

---

[73] Salembier, "Pierre d'Ailly," 516: "Précisons cette épineuse question. Colomb a certainement connu les œuvres du cardinal de Cambrai; c'est à lui qu'il a emprunté les traits fondamentaux de son système, nous l'avons démontré. Mais est-ce avant son premier voyage, quand, pauvre, exilé et repoussé de tous, il cherchait sa voie et tâchait d'émouvoir tour à tour en sa faveur la cour du roi de Portugal, la commission royale de Salamanque, le dominicain Diego de Déza, les Franciscains de la Rábida, puis enfin, à Santa Fé, les rois catholiques Ferdinand et Isabelle? Ou bien est-ce après son second voyage, quand il avait déjà découvert les îles qu'il cherchait dans l'ouest, quand il commençait à jouir des sourires de la fortune, des premiers rayons de la gloire et de la faveur des souverains? Est-ce avant 1492, époque de la première expédition, ou est-ce en 1494, au retour de son second voyage aux Antilles?"

[74] Ibid., 529: "c'est probablement à Espanola, dès 1494, nous l'avons dit, que les deux frères ont étudié ensemble l'Imago mundi. L'exemplaire appartenait à Barthélémy, qui l'avait sans doute acquis pendant son séjour en France, vers 1491 4. Il provenait des presses de Jean de Westphalie à Louvain; déjà son possesseur l'avait couvert d'un grand nombre d'observations, et c'est peut-être le premier volume imprimé qui ait passé l'atlantique. Les deux frères complétèrent ces notes qui sont au nombre de 898 et combinèrent ensemble tout le plan grandiose dont on leur a fait honneur et auquel ils ne pensaient pas auparavant. Nous voulons parler du projet de passer aux Indes orientales par l'ouest et d'aller au levant par le ponant."

[75] Ibid., 530: "Pour arriver à faire croire qu'il avait toujours eu ce que l'on a appelé son grand dessein et qu'il avait conçu depuis longtemps le projet d'arriver aux Indes par l'ouest, Christophe avait, en 1496, à employer deux moyens. Il élevait d'abord modifier ce qu'il avait écrit en 1492–1493 dans le Journal de bord de son premier voyage. Ensuite il avait besoin d'affirmer résolument dans les documents postérieurs qu'il avait eu, dès, l'origine, l'intention de passer au levant par le ponant. Nous le savons par ailleurs: à part une phrase de Las Casas, il n'est nullement question de ce plan grandiose, soit à la cour de Portugal, soit devant la junte de Salamanque, soit chez les religieux de la Rabida, soit enfin à Santa Fé. Le navigateur ne parle de ce projet que dans son Journal de bord. Il fallait donc le maquiller, le corriger et le compléter en y introduisant de force l'annonce de son dessein. Nous l'avons vu, c'est ce que Colomb a dû faire lorsqu'il a révisé son œuvre en y faisant entrer ce qu'il avait l'intention d'y mettre et ce qu'il voulait que le monde connût de son projet. Donc, pour les raisons énoncées dans le chapitre précédent, on ne peut rien tirer de concluant de tout ce qui a précédé les études communes de Christophe et de Barthélémy et de tout ce qu'il a plu au premier d'introduire dans le Journal de bord. Il est très probable, d'après tout ce qui précède, que c'est en 1494, au cours du second voyage et après avoir étudié et commenté d'Ailly avec Barthélémy, que s'est constitué le programme général des desseins de Colomb."

The best proof that Columbus was familiar with the cardinal's work is the copy of *Ymago mundi*, which is very heavily annotated by Christopher Columbus and his brother Bartolomeo,[76] now in the Biblioteca Colombina, established in Seville by Fernando, the second of Columbus' sons. Fortunately, these notes were published in 1930,[77] in a bilingual (Latin and French) edition, containing both the treatise and these marginal notes by Columbus. These notes remove any possible doubt in this respect.

Columbus' first note on chapter eight of *Ymago mundi* concerns the voyage of Bartolomé Díaz, then in the service of the King of Portugal in 1488, in command of the *Buena Esperanza*, which according to Columbus was 3,100 leagues from Lisbon.[78] Columbus adds that this agrees with what Ptolemy says, who corrects the supposed 27,500 *stadia* of the voyage of the Marin to the land of the Garamantes,[79] and concludes: this agrees with what Pierre d'Ailly says, that water does not cover three quarters of the earth and with the fact that the sea is navigable in spite of the heat.[80] Columbus summarises the reference to Aristotle with the sentence: between the end of Spain and the beginning of India there is a small sea that is navigable in a few days,[81] just as he summarises the reference to Pliny with the sentence: one can sail from the Arabian Gulf to Cadiz in a short time.[82]

---

[76] I have not counted them, but according to Salembier the number of notes written in the margins of this book is as high as 898, "Pierre d'Ailly," 391.

[77] *Ymago mundi* / de Pierre d'Ailly, Card. de Cambrai et Chancelier de l'Université de Paris (1350–1420); texte latin et trad. française des quatre traités cosmographiques de d'Ailly et des notes marginales de Christophe Colomb; étude sur les sources de l'auteur [par] Edmond Buron (Paris: Maisonneuve, 1930).

[78] Buron, 206–8: "Nota quod hoc anno de. 88. In mense decembri apu'it in vlixipona bartholomeus didacus capitaneus trium caravelarum quem miserat Serenissimus rex portugalie in guinea ad tentandum terram et renunciavit ipso Serenissimo regi prout navigaviter ultra Yan navigatum leuche .600. videlicet .450. ad austrum et .250. ad aquilonem usque uno promuntorio per ipsum nominatum 'cabo de boa esperança' quem in agesinba estimamus qui que in eo loco invenit se distare per astrolabium ultra linea equinoctiali gradus .45. quem ultimo locum distat ab vlixbona leuche .3100. quem viagium pictavit et scripsit de leucha in leucha in una carta navigationis ut occuli visui ostenderet ipso serenissimo regi in quibus omnibus interfui."

[79] Ibid., 208: "Hoc concordat cum dita marini quem Ptholomeus emendat de peragracione ad garamantes qui disit peragratum fuisse ultra equinoctalem stadii 27500, quod Ptholomeus impugnat et emendat."

[80] Ibid., 208: "Concordat cum petro de ayliaco quod aqua non coperit .3. quartas terre. Concordat quod mare sit tot navigabilem nec impedit maximum ardorem."

[81] Ibid., 208: "Aristotiles. Inter finem ispanie et principium indie est mare parvum et navigabile in paucis diebus."

[82] Ibid., 208: "Plinius. Navigatum est a sinu arabico usque ad Gades non multum magno tempore."

However, the most interesting note for our topic concerns 4 Ezra. After summarising succinctly in the margin what Pierre d'Ailly says ("Esdre. Sex partes sunt habitate et 7ª est coperta aquis"), Columbus confirms the saying of 4 Ezra about the six parts of land and one of water from the evidence of Pedro Comestor and from his own experience as a sailor,[83] and Columbus continues: "We have to take into account that St Ambrose, St Augustine and many others considered Ezra to be a prophet and approved his book, which does not seem to be apocryphal."[84] This is what Columbus attempts to prove with extracts from their works. In the case of Augustine, Columbus restricts himself to quoting *De civitate Dei*, but in the case of Francisco de Meron, he adds a quotation from *De veritatibus* as proof that Ezra is the last prophet before the New Testament,[85] and that although it is not a canonical book it is an authentic book, whose authority is confirmed by St. Ambrose.[86]

This way of understanding the authority of 4 Ezra was current in the Franciscan circles that influenced Christopher Columbus so much,[87] since this is what St. Bonaventure defends in his sermons, in which he quotes 4 Ezra as an authoritative book,[88] and, as we have seen, was explicitly set out by the Franciscan Roger Bacon.[89] This position would be defended during the Council of Trent by Giovanni Calvi, the general of the Franciscans, in his *Apologia pro libris canonicis*, where he writes that although

---

[83] Ibid., 210: "Et hoc dictum petri comestor concordat in illo de aqua, de qua si consideremus per ea que ad presens vidimus per navigationis inveniuntur esse verum."

[84] Ibid., 210: "Nota quod beatus Ambroxius et A. Augustinus et alii plures hebuerunt Esdram per prophetam et aprobaverunt librum suum ut inferius apparet per ea que hic extreti ex suis libris. Ypocraphi non videntur."

[85] Ibid., 210: "Franciscus de Meronis in Veritatibus ait: Duodecima veritas: quod postquam iudei redierunt de babilonia post malachiam, ageum et zachariam qui tunc prophetaverunt Et Esdran non habuerunt prophetam usque ad salvacionis adventum nisi Zachariam patrem Iohannem baptistam in ultimo capitulo."

[86] Ibid., 212: "Ex quo acipitur unum notabile quod Esdras fuit propheta et ideo eius prophetia licent non habeatur in canone videtur auctentica et confirmatur quia beatus ambroxius alegat ipsam accipiendo ditum illius prophetie morietur filius meus Ihesus et convertetur seculum."

[87] We should not forget that Columbus was welcomed by the Franciscan convent of La Rábida, near Palos, from 1485. See el studio detallado de A. Milhou, *Columbus y su mentalidad mesiánica in el ambiente franciscanista español* (Cuadernos Colombinos 11; Valladolid: Casa Museo de Columbus—Seminario americanista de la Universidad de Valladolid, 1983).

[88] Bonaventura, *Opera omnia* (Quaracchi: Collegium S. Bonaventura, 1882–1902), 9:56, 117, 119–20.

[89] See the text of *Opus majus* cited in note 62.

4 Ezra should not be placed in the list of canonical books it is a divine work as it contains divine sayings.[90]

I think that these notes by Columbus make the influence of 4 Ezra on the development of his thought absolutely clear and show the extreme importance that the apocryphon had on his American adventure.

3. The Effects of the Discovery

Very soon the influence of the discovery resounded throughout Europe and had an influence both on biblical interpretation and on Hebrew philology, as a few examples will show.

In a note on Ps 19 (18:5 in the Vulgate "in omnem terram exivit sonus eorum et in fines orbis terrae verba eorum") in a Polyglot Psalter published in Genoa in 1516, now in the Library of the Faculty of Theology in Leuven, edited by Augustinus Justinianus, with the collaboration of Jacobus Antiquarius, Bernardus Granellus, Gaspar de Varagine and Baptista Fliscus, and dedicated to Pope Leo X,[91] we can already read a description of Christopher Columbus as fulfilling the prophecy contained in the psalm. This prompts the author of the note to describe the life of the discoverer, who was chosen by God so that through him the prophecy of the psalm that his voice would resound in the confines of the world.[92] The commentator is fully informed about the origins of Columbus,[93] his naval training,[94] and about the way he arrives at his fundamental intuition of reaching the

---

[90] "Quarta proposition probat de libro Esdre atque tertio Machabeorum. Licet autem Ambrosius lib. De bono mortis cap. 10 et 11 vocet questionem Esdre divinarum scripturam, non intelligimus eam tamen esse inter canonicum catalogorum recensendam, divinam vero eo quodam aliquas contineret divinas sententias." In *Concilium Tridentinum Diariorum*, 12:481–82.

[91] *Psalterium, Hebraeum, Graecum, Arabicum & Chaldaeum cum tribus latinis interpretationibus & glossis*. Impressit miro ingenio Petrus Paulus Porrus, Genuae in aedibus Nicolai Iustiniani Pauli, 1516.

[92] *Psalterium*, C7 recto: "Et in finem mundi verba eorum. Saltem temporibus nostris quibus mirabili ausu Christophori columbi genuensis, alter pene orbis repertus est christianorumque cetui aggregatus. At vero quoniam Columbus frequenter predicabat fe a Deo electum ut per ipsum adimpleretur hec prophetia. non alienum existimavi vitam ipsius hos loco inferere."

[93] Ibid., C7 recto: "Igitur Christophorus cognomento columbus patri genuensis, vilibus ortus parentibus, nostra etate fuit qui sua industria, plus terrarum et pellagi exploraverit paucis mensibus, quam pene reliqui omnes mortales universis retro actis seculis."

[94] Ibid., C8 recto: "Hic puerilibus annis vix prima elementa edoctus, pubesces iam rei maritime operan dedit, dein perfecto in lusitaniam fratre, ac ulissipone questum instituente, pingendarum tabellarum ad usum maritimum, effigiantium maria et portus et litora, huius modi maritimos sinus atque insulas didicit ab eo."

Indies from the west, thanks to information from other explorers[95] and to his own studies and reflection.[96] However, he does not mention the influence of 4 Ezra. The note concludes with an estimate of the distance travelled[97] and an account of the death of Columbus, of whom he says that if he had been born at the time of the Greeks he would have been counted among the gods.[98]

The earliest example that I have found of the influence of the discovery on biblical exegesis and Hebrew philology is dated to 1545, when the famous bible by Robertus Stephanus (Roberto Estienne), known as the "la nonpareille" (nulli conferenda), was published. It contains the edition of the Vulgate that Robertus Stephanus had published in 1528, set out in two parallel columns and the new edition published in Zurich in 1543 by C. Forschauer, with a large number of marginal notes made by Franciscus Vatablus (François Vatable), professor of Hebrew in the Royal College.[99] Note 40, on the word "Ophir" in 1 Kings 9:28 explains that the Ophir from which they took 420 talents of gold to Solomon, is a remote island, located in the west, in the recently discovered territories. Today it is called Hispaniola, the name that Christopher Columbus gave it, and where this highly valued gold is found.[100] In a note on 1 Kgs 10:11, which

---

95 Ibid., C8 recto: "Qui ex regio instituto ibant quotannis ad explorandas inacessas ethiopum terras et oceani intra meridiem et occasum, remotas plagas. Cum quibus is pluries sermonem ferens queque ab his acceperat conferens cum hisque."

96 Ibid., C8 recto: "et in suis ipse iam dudum fuerat meditatus picturis, et legerat apud cosmographos, tandem venerat in opinionem posse omnino fieri, utqui ethiopum ad libicum vergentium litora linques, rectus dirigat iter zephirum et libicum navigationem, paucis mensibus aut insulam aliquam, aut ultimas indorum continentes terras assequeretur."

97 Ibid., C8 verso: "ex computatione colligebat Columbus eam insulam horis quatuor, Evangelista vero decem a gadibus, nec amplius duobus horis, hoc est duodecima parte totius circuli terrarum, ab eo loco quem Ptolomeus catigaro vocat et ultimum habitabilis in oriente sole constituit abesse. Quod si non obtiterit navigantibus solum bieni futurum ut ultimum oriens omni decurso inferiore nostro hemisperio, concrario cui su omnibus fuerit a tendentibus ad occidentem."

98 Ibid., D1 recto: "Hic fuit viri celeberrimi exitus, qui si grecorum heroum temporibus natus esset procul dubio in deorum numerum relatus esset."

99 *Biblia*, ex officina Roberti Stephani, Lutetia, 1545. The library of the Faculty of Theology of Louvain has three copies of this edition as well as a copy of the 1546 edition in which the name of Franciscus Vatablus appears as the author of these comments. These annotations by Vatablus were very popular and were reprinted very often until well into the 18th century. For example: *Biblia sacra cum universis Franc. Vatabli, regii Hebraecae linguae quondam professoris, et variorum interpretum annotationibus*. Latina interpretatio duplex est: altera vetus, altera nova. Editio postrema multo quam antehac emendatior & auctior. Parisii, Sumptibus Societatis, 1729.

100 "Ophir. insula est remotissima a sinu Ellamitico: nam tertio denum anno revertebatur inde. Vocatur hodie Spagnola, sic nominata a Christophoro Columbo; in Occidente est, in terra inventa nuper. est enim illic aurum laudatissimum."

states that the fleet that carried the gold from Ophir also took the wood called *'almuggim* to Solomon, Vatablus explains that the Hebrew word meant Galicia in Brazil, according to an expert in Hebrew.[101] Note 48 on 1 Kgs 10:22 states that Tarshish, where Solomon kept his fleet, is an island in the west.[102] And in a note 16 on 2 Chr 3:6, explaining the word *parwaim*, Vatablus suggests that perhaps the place in question could be Peru, the Great and the Small, since the word is in the dual, due to the similarity of the names.[103]

In the *Liber primus* of the *Chronographia* by Genebrard of 1576, to which Bellarmine alludes and which we have cited in note 50, the same idea occurs, but in a much more developed form: the gold of Ophir in 2 Chr 8:19 (and 1 Kings 9:28) and the gold of *Parwaim* of 2 Chr 3:6 come from Peru.[104] Genebrard explains this in the light of the discovery of the New World, which could be reached by the west, as the Spanish do, or by the east in the Portuguese manner.[105]

However, we can best appreciate the influence of the discovery, on both biblical exegesis and Hebrew philology, in the work by Arias Montano, a scholar from Seville. This is especially the case in his treatise *Phaleg*—dated May 1572 and included in volume seven of the Antwerp Polyglot—an exegetical and geographical commentary on Gen 10, that is, of the expansion of Noah's descendants after the flood.[106] In the second page of the introduction to his treatise, in the preface to the reader printed in italics, Arias Montano makes it clear at the outset that the discovery of the New World helps us to understand what the

---

[101] "Coraliorum. Doctus inter Hebraeos existimat vocem Hebraeam significare Gallice du Brasil."

[102] "Tarsis. Insula est hoc loco in Oceano ad Occidentem. Chaldeeus paraph. classis Aphrica. i. rex habebat classen quae per ipsum Oceanum ibat in Tarsis cum classe Hiran."

[103] "Numero duali dicitur apud Hebraeos. Fortasse locus ille qui nostro tempore dicitur le grand Peron et le petit Peron dicuntur: nam est maxima affinitas nominum."

[104] *Chronographiae*, 50: "Hebuit Salomon naves traicientes in Tharsis India regionum ad aurum, argentums, lapides pretiosos, pavones et c. 3 Par. 8. Inter hec est aurum quod appellatur in Hebraei ibid. c. 3. Parvaim, quasi allatum ex utruque Peru, quod hodie paret Hispano."

[105] Ibid., 50: "Dum ergo Scriptura hoc de Salomone et Iosaphat veluti singulare notat, posito etiam Parvaim vocabulo, quod dualis est numeri, quis non cernuit novum hoc orben nominari? Qui potuit ab ipsis aperiri fulcato mari sive versus Occidentem more Hispanico, sive versus Orientem Molucis praeter navigatis, ut faciunt Lusitani."

[106] *Phaleg, sive de gentium sedibus primis, orbisque terrae situ, liber*. Benedicto Aria Montano hispalensi auctore, Antverpiae, Excudebat Christophorus Plantinus Prototypographus Regius, ad sacri Apparatus instructionem. Anni MDLXXII.

Sacred Scriptures say.[107] Also, nothing that Greek or Roman writers say that has reached us can be compared with what Moses says clearly about the land of Ophir, and with what the books of Kings and Chronicles wrote under dictation from the Holy Spirit.[108] The reason is that the navigators in Solomon's fleet left exact proof of all the regions to which they went.[109] And the land from which Solomon's sailors took so much gold, then called *Parwaim*, is simply Peru, or more precisely, the two regions called Peru, since the word is in the dual, known today as Peru and as Hispaniola or New Spain, from which the purest gold comes.[110] This identification allows Arias Montano to question the interpretation of Jerome, whom he calls "Interpres quidam," who translated the Hebrew phrase והזהב זהב פרוים incorrectly as "Et aurum erat probatissimum." The correct translation according to the Hebraist from Seville, should be "Et aurum illud, aurum PERU, et PERU," since the dual of *peru* is *parwaim*.[111] In chapter 9 of his treatise, where the third part of the earth is considered, that is to say, the part allotted to the sons of Shem, Arias Montano elaborates even more on the identification of Ophir with Peru. When describing the expansion of the sons of Shem towards the east, Ophir advanced much further than the others—he alone occupying the vast lands that extend northwards along

---

[107] *Phaleg*, A2 verso: "quae nuper ab Hispanis navigantibus primum inventa esse creditur, noviisque orbis appellatur, ex ea, quae in sacris traditur libris, terrarum orbis descriptione, apertissime cognosci posse."

[108] Ibid., A2 verso: "nullus denique ex Graecis, Latinisve Scriptoribus, quorum scripta ad nostram usque pervenerunt aetatem, aliquid edidit, quod se, quale tamdem id sit, diligenter examinetur, comparari possit cum iis quae Moses de terra Ophir apertissime scriptsit, velque Ionathan Propheta, eius, quae est de Regibus Iudae, scriptor historiae, copiose ut exacte tradidit: aut com iis, quae ab eo qui Paralipomena Spiritu Sancto dictante scripsit, disertis sunt descripta verbis."

[109] Ibid., A2 verso: "Is enim non solum de classe a Salomone apud Tyrum aedificata, atque in eo maris rubri portu, qui Ghassion Gaber dicitur, instructa, Orienteque versus deducta, deque navigationis tempore et mora, de rebus inde atque ex illis insulis, continente, eiusque terrae littoribus, quae navigantes praeterlegebant, in alias regiones allatis, mentionem exactam facit."

[110] Ibid., A2 verso: "verum etiam terra illam, ex qua tanta optimi auri copia eliceretur, et ad alias gentes asportaretur, eam, inquam, terram, iam tum פרוים Paruaim appellantam esse, aperte docet. quae quidem dictio, iis qui vel tantum Hebraice sciunt legere, duas regiones, olim Peru dictas, clare demonstrat: unam quidem, quae eodem vocabulo, hodierno etiam die Peru dicitur: alteram vero, quae nova Hispania a navigantibus est appellata. Eius autem regionis aurum purissimum; atque in maximo pretio apud omnes gentes fuisse constat."

[111] Ibid., A2 verso: "Atque Interpres quidem, vel ob ignotam sibi regionem, vel potius in eius, quod illa regio exhibebat, auri laudem; cum in Hebraeo ita scriptum legatur, והזהב זהב פרוים .i. Et aurum illud, aurum PERU, et PERU, nam פרו in numero duali פרוים dicitur: ille, inquam, convertit: Et aurum erat probatissimum."

the great abyss[112]—and led his peoples and gave his name to the two regions separated by a long narrow isthmus. In Solomon's time it had a unique name, Ophir, but then this name was given to the two regions separately, each of them called Peru and both together as it was a noun in the dual, *Parwaim*.[113] Of course the argument that Arias Montano again uses is the abundance of gold, precious stones and *'almuggim* in Peru.[114] The treatise by Arias Montano ends with some summary tables in which he indicates the names in both Hebrew and Latin and indicates the sons of Japhet with Roman numerals, the sons of Shem with Arabic numerals, and the sons of Ham with capital letters. He also indicates the places where they live and their locations. These tables contain a couple of anomalies: Thisas is presented as a son of Gomer not of Japhet; Havila does not appear among the sons of Cush, but only among the descendants of Ham, although the spelling is Havila not Evila, as in the Vulgate. The four last entries[115] of "Filiorum Aram Sedes," who correspond to the sons of Yoqtan, show most clearly how the discovery of America had influenced Arias Montano's exegesis of the biblical text. Number 19 is on Ophir, called Peru when the books of Chronicles were written.[116] The two numbers 21 deal with the peoples that descended from Yoqtan and the regions they inhabit: Yobab is the region of the New World called Parias,[117] and Sefar is the mountain range of the Andes, where the city of Yuctan is located, which preserves the name of the ancestor.[118]

Quite probably Arias Montano knew the notes made by Franciscus Vatablus, much in vogue since 1545, because in 1599, the year after Montano's

---

[112] *Phaleg*, 12, col. b: "Post hunc porro processit Ophir, latissimeque patentes terras, secundum abyssi magna littora ad Ortum extentus, solus obtinuit."

[113] Ibid., 12, col. b: "Porro Ophir, quem antea diximus, secundum abyssi magnae littora genus nomenque produxit suum, ad duas regiones angusto terrarum, sed longo isthmo interiecto distinctas, quae ad Salomonis usque atque ulteriora etiam tempora integrum retinuere vocabulum Ophir; quod paulo post inversum uttique etiam parti seorsum adscriptum est, atque alteruttra pars Peru; utraque autem simul dualis numeri pronuntiatione Peruaim sive Parvaim dicta est."

[114] Ibid., 12, col. b: "Ophir omnis, sive utraque Peru regio, auro abundat plurimo; inde etiam ligna Almugim mirae in aedificiorum ornamentis pulchritudinis, et pretiosi lapidis magna affertur copia."

[115] Aunque sólo figuran tres números, porque el 21 es repetido. Estas tablas no están paginadas.

[116] *Phaleg*: "Ophire sive Opire. Peru sic etiam dicta, quo tempore Paralipomenon historia conscripta est. 2. Paralip. 3. 6."

[117] Ibid.: "Iobab. Novi orbis dicti pars vocata regio PARIAS, auro margaritisque abundans."

[118] Ibid.: "Sepher mons. Longissimus omnium montium, qui hactenus in orbe visi sunt, a nostriis ANDES dictur; in illa orbis antiquissima IUKTAN, quae nomen auctoris illius Gentis retinet."

death, the *Biblia sacra Hebraice, Graece et Latine* appeared in Heidelberg. It includes the annotations by Vatablus, and for which Arias Montano had collated the text with the edition of the Complutensian Polyglot,[119] although he makes no reference to the tentative identification by the Hebraist from Paris of *Parwaim* with Peru. For Arias Montano the identification is the direct result of his own interpretation of Scripture, an interpretation which he felt was supported by the authority of Agustín Hinneo, Professor of Theology in Leuven, whom he asked to read the treatise before it was printed and who confirmed that what Arias Montano wrote is completely in agreement with the biblical text and that the descriptions of the ancient geographers cannot be compared with Scripture.[120] Nor does Arias Montano refer much explicitly to the text of 4 Ezra, even though his treatise is covered with biblical quotations in the margins and that the Antwerp Polyglot, for which he is responsible and in which the *Phaleg* is published, contains, as we have said, the edition of 4 Ezra in its traditional position. I think I have found an echo of the text of 4 Ezra in one of the sentences that Arias Montano uses in chapter 5 of his geographical treatise, when he states that the surface of the land is not greater than the expanse of the sea.[121] The only explicit quotation is of 4 Ezra 7:3 "Mare positum in spacioso loco ut esset altum et immensum," but it is significant that this quotation follows the quotation of Job 11:9 ("Longior terra mensura eius, et latior mari") and above all, that both quotations, noted in the margin, are preceded by the formula of explicit quotation: "S.S. E.," which indicates that he attributes the same authority to both books.[122]

---

[119] *Biblia sacra Hebraice, Graece et Latine* Latina interpretatio duplex est, altera vetus, altera nova: cum annotationibus Francisci Vatabli Hebraicae linguae quondam Lutetiae professoris regii. Omnia cum editione Complutensi . . . collata . . . / Editio postrema, multo quam ante hac emendatior: cui etiam nunc accessit, ne quid in ea desiderari posset Novum Testamentum Graecolatinum. Ben. Ariae Montani Hispalensis. Heidelbergae, ex officina Commeliniana, 1599.

[120] *Phaleg*, A2 verso: "Erat nuper apud me vir longe doctissimus, AUGUSTINUS HUNNAEUS, qui regis stipendiis in celeberrimo Lovaniensi Gymnasio Theologiam docet, is, inquam, cum hosce de Sacra Geographia Commentarios conscriberem, eaquae de terrae, marisque situ iam scripsseram, legeret, eas res adeo diserte ac manifeste sacris contineri libris summopere mirabatur: ac potissimum eo in argumento, de quo antiqui Geographi cum scripserunt, atque ea que aut ipsi viderant, aut ab aliis audiverant, memoriae prodiderunt, omnia fabulis, ac falsis descriptionibus corruperunt, atque hac ratione veritatem tenebris obvoluerunt."

[121] Ibid., 10 col. a: "Terrae autem aquarumque globus ita compactus est, ut ab Ortu in Occasum per Aquilonem longior terra quam mare sit. Latitudinem vero ab Aquilone terra, a Meridie mare occuper, quod ab Orientis regionibus in Occidentem deflexum terra duplicis maris nomine alluit."

[122] Ibid., 9 col. b.

In any case, whereas in volume six of the Alcalá Polyglot, which contains the Hebrew dictionary and grammar,[123] the word פרוים is defined neutrally and traditionally as the place from which gold of a special quality comes and which is only found there,[124] the discovery of America had influenced the exegesis of Arias Montano to such an extent that for him there was no doubt at all that פרוים is Peru.

[123] Whose *explicit* tells us that it was completed on the last day of May, 1515 and that, as we have said, does not include 4 Ezra.

[124] "Paruaim. Nomen proprium loci vnde ferebatur aurum probatiffimum. 2. Paralip. 3. Porro aurum erat probatiffimum pro quo he. le. Et aurum erat aurum pharuaim.& solum inuenitur in predicto loco."

CHAPTER ELEVEN

THE AUTHORITY OF 4 EZRA AND THE JEWISH ORIGIN OF (NATIVE) AMERICAN INDIANS

While wondering about a topic for the volume in honour of Prof. Jesús González Luis, who became a close friend when we were together in Jerusalem in what now seems the distant past and through whom I discovered the Canaries, I suddenly thought of returning to a theme that I had discussed recently in a Festschrift for a colleague from Salamanca. This was the authority of 4 Ezra in Spain and its influence on the discovery of America[1]—not only for the well-known connections of the Canaries with the discovery of America, but also because a Bishop of the Canaries (Antonio de la Cruz) was among those who opposed the decision of the fourth session of the Council of Trent, on the 8th of April, 1548, not to include 4 Ezra among the canonical books. The opinion of the Bishop of the Canaries is clear: "*Placent decreta, Unum tamen addam, ne libri Esdrae deleantur de suo loco*."[2] In spite of the efforts of Antonio de la Cruz, the decision of the Council was to remove 4 Ezra from its traditional position between the books of Nehemiah and Tobias, where it appears in mediaeval manuscripts, and to relegate it to an appendix, resulting in its progressive loss of authority.

As a token of my friendship with Prof. Jesús González Luis, who is from the Canaries, I have wished to focus on one element of 4 Ezra which I did not discuss in detail in my previous study: the influence of this apocryphal book in the debate on the Jewish origin of the American Indians. It is not a completely new topic and has been discussed in detail recently by Francis Schmidt,[3] but it is sufficiently unusual for us to consider it a little more.

---

[1] F. García Martínez, "La autoridad de 4 Esdras y el descubrimiento de América." Published above as ch. 10, "The Authority of 4 Ezra and the Discovery of America."

[2] *Concilium Tridentinum: Diariorum, Actorum, Epistularum, Tractatum: Nova Collectio* (ed. S. Merkle; Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1901–1938), 5:87.

[3] F. Schmidt, "Arzareth en Amérique: L'autorité du *Quatrième Livre d'Esdras* dans la discussion sur la parenté des juifs et des Indiens d'Amérique (1530–1729)," in *Moïse géographe*" *Recherches sur les représentations juives et chrétiennes de l'espace* (ed. A. Desreumaux and F. Schmidt; Paris: Vrin, 1988), 155–201. See also ch. 9 "Of Monsters, Indians and Jews" in A. Hamilton, *The Apocryphal Apocalypse: The Reception of the Second Book of Esdras*

This element occurs in the explanation that the angel gives to Ezra in the vision of the man arising from the sea in 4 Ezra 13. However, my interest lies in none of the important theological aspects which form part of this explanation (such as identifying the man who emerges from the sea as the pre-existing Messiah whom the Most High calls "filius meus") but in the reference to the ten tribes of Israel, which is what unleashed the polemic concerning the possible Jewish origin of the American Indians.

In his authoritative commentary on 4 Ezra, Michael Stone says:

> It is perhaps a curious footnote that, at the time of the discovery of the New World, 4 Ezra entered the debate that raged between scholars, both Catholic and Protestants, as to the origins of native American peoples. It was the passage in 4 Ezra 13:39–46 relating the withdrawal of the ten tribes, that was at the center of the debate by prominent authors. One party claimed, on this basis, that the American Indians were of Jewish descent, having originated from the ten tribes, while others denied this vigorously. Positions held in this debate were related, as F. Schmidt has shown, to opposed attitudes to the authority of the Apocrypha in general and of 4 Ezra in particular.[4]

The text to which Stone refers and is the subject of this note, is as follows:[5]

> 39 Et quoniam vidisti eum colligentem ad se aliam multitudinem pacificam,[6]
> 40 haec sunt decem tribus,[7] quae captivae factae sunt de terra sua in diebus Iosiae regis,[8] quem captivum[9] duxit Salmanassar rex Assyriorum, et

---

(*4 Ezra*) *from the Renaissance to the Enlightenment* (Oxford-Warburg Studies; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999), 204–23.

[4] M. E. Stone, *Fourth Ezra: A Commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 47.

[5] I am quoting from the critical edition by A. F. J. Klijn, *Der lateinische Text der Apokalypse des Esra* (TUGAL 131; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1983), 84–85, which has several differences with respect to the standard edition by R. Weber, in the *Biblia Sacra Iuxta Vulgatam versionem* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1983), 2:1964–65. Weber includes 4 Ezra in the Appendix and prefers other readings based in various manuscripts. In the notes I indicate the most important variants and the additions from the Codex Legionensis, which is quite expansive.

[6] Codex Legionensis adds "plebem."

[7] One part of the manuscript omits the figure. "Decem" is the reading in the codices Sangermanensis and in the second hand of codex Ambianensis; the Spanish manuscripts Complutensis, Abulensis y Legionensis preserve the reading "novem," which is from the Ethiopic tradition and the one preferred in Weber's edition; two Ethiopic manuscripts read "nine and a half," which is the reading preferred by Stone, 404; Codex Legionensis adds "Israel."

[8] Other manuscripts give the kings in question different names: Hosiah (Abulensis), Hosea (Ambianensis, second hand), Hezekiah (Legionensis, which adds "iudeorum").

[9] In spite of the use of the singular, it is clear that the text refers to the ten tribes.

transtulit eos trans flumen,[10] et translati sunt in terram aliam. 41 Ipsi autem sibi dederunt consilium hoc, ut derelinquerent multitudinem gentium, et proficiscerentur in ulteriorem regionem, ubi nunquam[11] inhabitavit ibi[12] genus humanum, 42 ut vel ibi observarent legitima[13] sua, quae non fuerant servantes in regione sua. 43 Per introitus autem angustos fluminis Eufraten introierunt.[14] 44 Fecit enim eis tunc Altissimus[15] signa,[16] et statuit venas[17] fluminis[18] usquequo transirent. 45 Per eam[19] enim regionem erat via multa itineris anni unius et dimidii,[20] nam regio illa vocatur[21] Arzareth.[22] 46 Tunc inhabitaverunt ibi usque in novissimo tempore. Et nunc iterum coeperunt[23] venire, 47 iterum Altissimus statuet venas fluminis,[24] ut posint transire.[25] Propter hoc vidisti multitudinem[26] collectam cum pace, 48 sed et qui derelicti sunt de populo tuo, qui invenientur intra terminum[27] meum sanctum.[28] 49 Erit ergo quando incipiet perdere multitudinem earum quae collectae sunt gentes, proteget qui superaverit populum.[29] 50 Et tunc ostendet eis multa plurima portenta.[30] (4 Ezra 13:39–50)

---

[10] Once again Codex Legionensis provides additional information: the name of the river, "Gozan."

[11] Weber prefers the addition "quisquam" from the French group and reads "nunquam quisquam."

[12] Codex Legionensis adds "aliquando."

[13] The Syriac and Ethiopic versions read "law" in the singular. The Latin tradition is uniform in reading the plural.

[14] Codex Legionensis adds "ad illam terram."

[15] Codex Legionensis adds "dominus."

[16] Codex Legionensis adds "et mirabilia magna."

[17] The versions read "fuentes" both here and in v. 47.

[18] Codex Legionensis adds "euphrates currencium aquas."

[19] Codex Legionensis understands the text differently, since it reads: "transierunt per eum ad illam regionem. Quia."

[20] Codex Legionensis adds "longa."

[21] Codex Legionensis adds "nomine."

[22] The name of the region varies slightly in the manuscripts: Arzaret, Arzar (the reading preferred by Weber "Arzar, et"), arxar, aszaren, and is generally considered to be derived from Hebrew אחרת ארץ "other land."

[23] Codex Legionensis adds "inde profiscere et revertentibus."

[24] Codex Legionensis adds "euphrates iterum sic et prius."

[25] Codex Legionensis adds "per medium eius."

[26] Codex Legionensis adds "plebis."

[27] The Arabic versions read "mountain."

[28] Codex Legionensis adds "per opera bona fides que habuerit salvabitur" agreeing essentially with the Syriac version which adds "they will be saved," a reading accepted by Stone, 394.

[29] Codex Legionensis reads: "de populo omnem iustum."

[30] Codex Legionensis adds "et variis miraculorum signa."

This text has been translated by the Argentine Gabriel Nápole as follows:[31]

> 39 Given that you saw them adding (lit. joining) another peaceful crowd to themselves: 40 these are the ten tribes, who were made captives of their land in the days of king Hosea; those whom Salmanaser (Shalmanezer), king of Assyria, made captive. He led them through the river and they were taken to another land. 41 However, they gave each other this advice: they had to abandon the multitude of peoples and head towards a more distant region, where no-one from humankind had lived, 42 so that, in this place, those who were not servants in their (own) land would keep the commandments. 43 They entered through the narrow pass of the River Euphrates. 44 Then the Most High worked marvels in their favour and held back the water-courses of the river until they crossed to the other side. 45 In that region there was a long path, a journey of a year and half. Now the region is called Arzareth. 46 Then they lived there until the last times. And now that they began to come again, 47 the Most High will once again hold back the water-courses of the river so that they can cross. This is why you have seen the multitude reunited in peace. 48 But also there are those of your people who were abandoned, those who will be found within my holy frontier. 49 Then it will happen when He will begin to destroy the multitude of peoples who were gathered (but) He will protect the people who will survive. 50 And then He will show portents to them.

[31] Gabriel Marcelo Nápole, *Liber Ezrae Quartus: Estudio de la obra, tradución crítica y notas exegéticas a partir de la versión latina* (Valencia: Facultad de Teología San Vicente Ferrer, 1998), 163–64: "39 Dado que lo has visto uniendo a sí mismo otra multitud pacífica: 40 éstas son las diez tribus, que fueron hechas cautivas de su tierra en los días del rey Hosea; a quienes llevó cautivo Salmanasar, rey de Asiria. El los condujo a través del río y fueron llevados a otra tierra. 41 Sin embargo, ellos se dieron entre sí este consejo: que abandonaran la multitud de pueblos y se dirigieran a una región más lejana, donde ninguno del género humano hubiera habitado allí, 42 para que así, en ese lugar, aquellos que no fueron servidores en su tierra observaran sus mandatos. 43 Entraron por el paso angosto del río Eufrates. 44 Entonces el Altísimo hizo prodigios en su favor y detuvo los canales del río hasta que pasaron al otro lado. 45 En aquella región se encontraba un camino extenso de un año y medio de viaje. Ahora la región es llamada Arzaret. 46 Entonces habitaron allí hasta el último tiempo. Y ahora que comenzaron a venir nuevamente, 47 el Altísimo detendrá otra vez los canales del río para que puedan pasar. Por eso has visto a la muchedumbre reunida en paz. 48 However también son aquellos de tu pueblo que fueron abandonados, los que serán encontrados dentro de mi santa frontera. 49 Será entonces cuando El comenzará a destruir la multitud de pueblos que fueron reunidos (however) protegerá al pueblo que sobrevivirá. 50 Y entonces les mostrará muchísimos portentos."

The recent Spanish translation by Domingo Muñoz León is as follows:[32]

> 39 And regarding what you saw, that he assembled close to himself another peaceful crowd: 40 these are the ten tribes, who were made captives (transporting them) out of their land in the days of king Josiah; those whom Salmanaser (Shalmanezer), king of Assyria, made captive, and he took them beyond the River and they were transferred to another land. 41 However, they decided to leave the multitude of gentiles and walk to a further region, where mankind had never lived, 42 in order to keep their precepts there, which they had not kept in their (own) land. 43 They entered through the narrow entrances of the Euphrates. 44 For the Most High made signs for them and held back the springs of the river while they crossed. 45 For through that region there was a long path, a journey of a year and half, and that region is called Arzareth. 46 There they lived there until the end of days; and then, when they begin to return, 47 the Most High will once again hold back the springs of the river so that they could cross. This is why you saw the multitude assembled in peace. 48 However also (this multitude forms) those of your people who remained within the holy territory. 49 Thus, when (the Most High) begins to annihilate the allied peoples, he will protect (his) people that stayed. 50 And then He will show portents to them.

As can be seen, the two translations are very similar, which is an indication that there are no major problems with the text. There are a few differences, due sometimes to one or another manuscript reading and occasionally to different choices in translation. The king under whom the deportation took place was Hosea for Marcelo Nápole and Josiah for Muñoz León. For the former, Arzareth is the current name for the region in question whereas for the latter it was always known by that name. The

---

[32] D. Muñoz León, "Libro IV de Esdras," in *Apócrifos del Antiguo Testamento VI* (ed. A. Díez Macho and A. Piñero; Madrid: Cristiandad, 2009), 456: "39 Y respecto a lo que vistes que él reunía junto a sí a otra muchedumbre pacífica: 40 éstas son las diez tribus que fueron hechas cautivas (llevándolas) fuera de su tierra en los días del rey Josías, a quienes llevó cautivas Salmanansar, rey de los asirios, y los llevó más allá del Río y fueron transladados a otra tierra. 41 Pero ellos determinaron dejar la muchedumbre de los gentiles y marchar a una región ulterior, donde nunca había habitado el género humano 42 a fin de observar allí sus preceptos, que no habían guardado en su país. 43 Ellos entraron por las estrechas entradas del Eúfrates. 44 Pues el Altísimo les hizo signos y contuvo los manantiales del río mientras pasaron. 45 Pues por aquella región había un largo camino, de un año y medio de viaje, y aquella región se llama Arzareth. 46 Allí habitaron hasta el final de los días; y luego, cuando comenzaron a retornar, 47 el Altísimo contuvo de nuevo los manantiales del río para que pudieran pasar. Por esto viste la muchedumbre recogida en paz. 48 Pero también (forman esa muchedumbre) los que quedaron de tu pueblo que se mantuvieron dentro del territorio santo. 49 Así pues, cuando (el Altísimo) comience a aniquilar a las gentes coaligadas, protegerá a (su) pueblo que ha quedado. 50 Y entonces les mostrará grandes portentos."

difference between "water-courses" and "sources" is due to the preference for the reading "venas" of the Latin text by one scholar and by the choice of "fuentes" in the text of the versions by the other. Whether the portents were to be numerous or great is due to the distinct meaning given to "plurima," and whether it would be those who "were abandoned" or those who "remained" within my "frontier" or "territory" is equally due to different choices in translating "derelicti sunt" and "terminum." However, in essence, both translators are in perfect agreement. For both, the text records the legend of the ten lost tribes who at the end of time (in the time of the Messiah) would return to join the rest of Israel and be saved.

It is surprising that neither Nápole nor Muñoz León alludes to the discussion which is the subject of this note: identifying the lost tribes with the inhabitants of America, even though this identification had been discussed extensively since the 16th century both in Spain and in the rest of Europe, and in the 17th century would give rise to endless discussions both in the Dutch Jewish world and among English Puritans, due to the account that Antonio Montezinos had given in front of the Jewish community of Amsterdam of his meeting with the Indian-Jews in Colombia.[33] In this note I will only consider discussions of the 16th century.

The legend of the lost tribes originates in the Bible. In 2 Kgs 17:6 we read: "In the ninth year of Hoshea the king of Assyria captured Samaria; he carried the Israelites away to Assyria. He placed them in Halah, on the Habor, the river of Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes." The biblical text clearly states that all "this occurred because the people of Israel had sinned against the Lord their God, who had brought them up out of the land of Egypt from under the hand of Pharaoh king of Egypt. They had worshiped other gods" (2 Kgs 17:7). And it ends: "The people of Israel continued in all the sins that Jeroboam committed; they did not depart from them until the Lord removed Israel out of his sight, as he had foretold through all his servants the prophets. So Israel was exiled from their own land to Assyria until this day" (2 Kgs 17:22–23).

---

[33] Montezinos, also known as Aarón Levi, was a Jew of Portuguese origin, from a family of "marranos," who established himself in New Granada, where he was detained by the Inquisition. Once set free, he spent six months in Holland. His account was published in 1650 by Rabbi Menasseh Ben Israel in his מקוה ישראל. *Esto es Esperança de Israel*, in Amsterdam, in the printing press of Semuel Ben Israel Soeiro, Year 5410. On the influence of this work on discussions in the 17th century, see Schmidt, "Arzareth en Amérique," 185–90.

The revised reading of these texts by 4 Ezra adds a new exodus of the exiled tribes, who walk from Assyria towards a distant and uninhabited region (Arzareth), keeping themselves apart from the gentiles so as to be able to keep those divine precepts the forgetting of which had originated the exile. Furthermore, 4 Ezra adds some clear millenarist nuances, since it has transferred the situation to the end of time, when it prophesies the reunion of the chosen people and their final salvation, a key element in the discussions of the 16th century.

Apparently, the first scholar to make use of 4 Ezra as an argument in defence of the Jewish origin of the American Indians was a certain Doctor Roldán, who had written a short treatise in seven folios, dated about 1540, now kept in the *Biblioteca Provincial y Universitaria de Sevilla* (ms 333).[34] Guillelmo Gliozzi uses a manuscript copy, now in the *Colección de Don Juan Bautista Muñoz*, which has the title: "Razones por las que el Doctor Roldán basa su afirmación de que las Indias estuvieron pobladas por las diez tribus de Israel."[35] Roldán provides several arguments to support his thesis, the first of which is precisely the authority of 4 Ezra 13:41–45 which he cites as proof. Roldán continues by calculating the distance travelled from Nineveh based on a rate of 20 miles per day during the year and a half mentioned by 4 Ezra—deducting sabbaths and the Passover, when the Hebrews did not walk—until they reached the country where the Indians now live. Roldán bases his second argument on a quotation from the prophet Hosea, who states that the children of Israel would be as many as the sand of the sea,[36] which would be perfectly suitable for the Indians, who are the largest nation on earth in view of the immense extent of the regions they have inhabited. The third argument is of a linguistic nature: according to Roldán there are several words of Hebrew origin in the American language, with the same meaning and pronunciation. The examples he gives are pure fantasy: for example *Haiti* comes from the Hebrew noun *Aith*, the river *Hayna* derives from Hebrew *Hain*, which

[34] The manuscript was made known by L. Hanke in *The First Social Experiments in America: A Study of the Development of Spanish Indian Policy in the Sixteenth Century* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1935), 72 and has been analysed in detail by Guillelmo Gliozzi, *Adamo e il Nuovo Mundo. La nascita dell'antropologia como ideologia coloniale: dalle genealogie bibliche alle teorie razziali* (*1500–1700*) (Pubblicazioni del Centro di studi del pensiero filosofico del Cinquecento e del Seicento in relazione ai problemi della scienza del Consiglio nazionale delle Ricerche 1.7; Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1977), 49–53.

[35] Gliozzi, *Adamo e il Nuovo Mundo*, 50, n. 1.

[36] Roldán refers to Hos 4 although in fact the reference should be Hos 1:10 (!).

means spring, *Cacique* comes from *Acasin*, and *charibe*, the name for Indians who eat human flesh, derives from Hebrew *Carita*, which according to Roldán means *occursus ignis*, since these Caribes eat the Indians and burn everything wherever they go.[37] His fourth argument is just as fantastic, based on similarity of customs, since according to Roldán, *the Indians* practised circumcision, daily ablutions, not touching the dead, repudiating wives, and the chiefs were polygamous like the Old Testament patriarchs. In addition, the Indians had other unique customs as a result of their falling into idolatry, such as sacrificing children to idols, sacrificing on mountains, in woods and under trees, or being cannibals.[38]

Roldán's manuscript was never published, even though it seems to have influenced other writers considerably, for example, Diego Durán, a half-caste Mexican Dominican. Although he does not openly say so, he paraphrases or copies it faithfully in his *Historia de las Indias de Nueva España y Islas de tierra firme*, written between 1579 and 1581, which was also to remain unpublished until 1867.[39] And as we shall see, it was used extensively by Juan de Torquemada.

The first book to be published that attributes a probable Jewish origin to the American Indians is the famous *Chronography* by Gilbert Genebrard, where the idea is presented as completely new. Genebrard had been professor of Hebrew in the Royal College in Paris and archbishop of Aix, and in 1567 had published his *Chronographiae libri quatuor*, which became a very influential work and was republished frequently. In it he defends the traditional (anti-Tridentine) position regarding the authority of 4 Ezra with an original proof: 4 Ezra is not included in the first canon of scripture because it had not yet been written, but it is to be found in the second canon, which is more extensive.[40] In this 1567 edition, the influence of the discovery of America on the biblical exegesis of the bishop of

---

37 Gliozzi, *Adamo e il Nuovo Mundo*, 51.

38 Ibid., 52.

39 Ibid., 54: "Duran si inspira evidentemente al manoscrito di Roldán, che in molti punti si limita a parafraseare o a riportare letteralmente."

40 "Tertius et quartus Ezrae, qui nominatur, non sunt de priore canone Hebraeorum, quia nondum erant editi, quando Canon iste sancitus est in hac magna Synodo, cuius fuit Ezra scriba, et cuius meminere lolemniter omnes Hebraei. At non definunt esse sacri et canonici, quoniam haec Synodus non obligabat consecutus auctores factos, nec spiritus sancti afflatum extinguebat vel contrahebat, propter quos editus est alte Canon multo amplior, ut significat Ioseph, lib. 2. Contra Appionem, quando citat versum Ecclesiastici libro tanquam scriptura sacra." Quote from the 1580 edition: Gilb. Genebradi Theologi Parisiensis Divinarum Hebraicarumque Literarum Professoris Regii, *Chonographiae libri quatuor*, Parisiis, apud Aegidium Garbinum, 1580, 90.

Aix is already obvious: for example the gold of Ophir of 2 Chr 8:19 (and of 1 Kgs 9:28) and the gold from *Parwaim* of 2 Chr 3:6 would have come from Peru,[41] which Genebrard explains in the light of the discovery of the New World, which can be reached via the west, as the Spaniards do, or via the east, in the Portuguese manner.[42] However, in this edition, the idea that the Indians could be the descendants of the ten lost tribes of Israel does not appear yet. In a later revised and extended edition of his *Chronography*,[43] the authority of 4 Ezra is a crucial factor in Genebrard's argument regarding the probable Jewish origin of the Indians, who had come from the place to which the Jews had been exiled, and Genebrard is surprised that nobody had thought of this before.[44] Genebrard recalls the origin of the legend of the lost tribes, the deportation of the ten tribes to Assyria,[45] and locates the place of exile in the desert of Tartarus, the northernmost place of the east and the closest to the Persian Empire.[46] Genebrard sets out the reasons for identifying the lost tribes with the Tartars who would be their descendants, whom he notes practised circumcision before Mohammed.[47] From there, the tribes would have crossed to America, which he tries to prove with four arguments. The first two are fairly generic (their disappearance from the east and the presence of

---

41 "Hebuit Salomon naves traicientes in Tharsis India regionum ad aurum, argentums, lapides pretiosos, pavones et c. 3 Par. 8. Inter hec est aurum quod appellatur in Hebraei ibid. c. 3. Parvaim, quasi allatum ex utruque Peru, quod hodie paret Hispano." *Chronographiae*, 50.

42 "Dum ergo Scriptura hoc de Salomone et Iosaphat veluti singulare notat, posito etiam Parvaim vocabulo, quod dualis est numeri, quis non cernuit novum hoc orben nominari? Qui potuit ab ipsis aperiri fulcato mari sive versus Occidentem more Hispanico, sive versus Orientem Molucis praeter navigatis, ut faciunt Lusitani." *Chronographiae*, 50.

43 I am citing from the 1599 edition: Gilberti Genebradi Theologi Parisiensis Divinarum Hebraicarumque Literarum Professoris Regii Aquensis Archiepiscopus *Chonographiae libri quatuor.* Lugduni, Apud Ioannem Pillehotte, 1599.

44 "Est etiam probabile earum partem esse populos Americae sive Indiae occidentalis (quod miror a nullo animadversum)." Ibid., 159.

45 "Haec est clades extrema regum et decem tribuum, qua sexto Ezechiae reges Juda ultra montes Medorum et Persarum abductae sunt, missis aliis in earum terram. Hae Orienti et Septemtrioni infuse, Iudaeorum clausorum fabulae dedere causam : qua de re extat Eldad Danius a nobis versus." Ibid., 158.

46 "Perditas in Oriente aiunt Hebraei. Interea facile assensum praebuerim iis, qui ex istis, ortos Tartaros opinantur, sive quia Tartari tenent oram Septemtrionalem Orientis et Aquilonis, sive quia illorum praecipuum imperium Persico imminet, eoque terminatur a parte Assyriae et Mediae, sive quia latuerunt, et ignoti permanserunt." Ibid., 158.

47 "Denique quoniam Circumcisionem sunt perpetuo amplexi, antequam quicquid accepissent de infaelici Mahomete, cui et facile aassenserunt quod in multis suae legi et moribus congrueret." Ibid., 158.

subterranean tombs in the Azores with Hebrew inscriptions),[48] as is the fourth (that one old tradition and the Cabala calls the Jews *clausi*, which would fit the fact that America is surrounded on all sides by water and is either an island or a peninsula).[49]

His third argument is the one that interests us most here, since it relies on the authority of 4 Ezra. After citing the (partly summarised) text of 4 Ezra 13:41–45, Genebrard explains how the twelve tribes could have reached Arzareth, which is in America, after crossing the Euphrates in much the same way that their ancestors crossed the Red Sea. First the tribes reached the desert of Tartarus and from this unknown land they then went to Greenland and from there to America, since in this region America is accessible as there is no sea there, whereas elsewhere it is surrounded by the sea.[50]

Doctor Roldán's ideas were known in America, as is proved by the use Diego Durán makes of them that we have mentioned, and Genebrard's *Chronography*, which was extremely popular. In both writings, the authority of 4 Ezra is central in proving the Jewish origin of the Indians. This idea must have been so widespread that the Jesuit José de Acosta feels obliged to refute it in detail, devoting chapter 23 of the first book of his *Historia Natural y Moral de las Indias* to it.[51] As Father de Acosta notes in his "Proemio al lector," this first book (like the second) was written while the author was still living in Peru:

---

[48] "Primo, quia traduntur perditae in Oriente, *R. Selom. Cant. Salom. 2.* Secundo, quia in insulis S. Michaelis sive Essoris ad illam urbem pertinentibus sepulcra subterranean a nostris reperta sunt cum litteris Hebraicis. antiquissimis" Ibid., 159.

[49] "Quarto, quia Iudaeos appelant clausos veteri traditione et Cabbala. Constat autem Americos clausos undique mari, ac Americam vel ese magnam insulam, vel peninsulam. Nam adhuc dubitatur utrum a partibus Septemtrionis iuncta sit continenti Asiae sive Tartariae magnae, vel a ea frero duntaxat exclusa ut ab orbe antarctico, versus austrum, per fretum Magellianicum" Ibid. 159.

[50] "Tertio, quia 4 Ezrae 13. Profectae narrantur *in ulteriorem regionem, ubi nunquam inhabitavit genus humanum. Per introitus autem angustos fluminis Eufraten introierunt. Fecit enim eis Deus signa et stitit venas fluminis, quousque transirent. Per eam enim regionem erat via multa itineris anni unius et dimidii. Nam regio illa vocatur Asareth*, עשרת quasi transito Euphrate venerint in Tartarica deserta, indeque in illam terram ignotam versus Grotlandiam. Nam ab illa parte America dicitur aperta et sine mari cum aliis ex partibus sit mari clausa et peninsula. Quin et per angusta freta, maria etiam vastissima eo pervenire potuerunt, ut in regiones solo mari a Tartaria diremptas" Ibid., 159 (in the original, the quotation from 4 Ezra is in italics).

[51] *Historia Natural y Moral de las Indias, en que se tratan las cosas notables del cielo, y elementos, metales, plantas, y animales dellas, y los ritos,y ceremonias, leyes, y govierno, y guerras de los Indios.* Compuesta por el Padre Joseph de Acosta, Religioso de la Compañia de Jesús. Impreso en Sevilla en cas de Juan de Leon, Año 1590.

> It only remains to warn the Reader that the first two books of this history or discourse were written while I was in Peru, and the other five later in Europe, as obedience had ordered me to return here. So, the former speak of the matters of the Indians as matters that are present, and the latter as of matters that are absent. So that the difference in speaking would not cause offence, I thought I would indicate the reason here.[52]

These first two books had originally been written in Latin:

> The first two books deal with what touches the sky and temperament and abode of that world: I had first written these books in Latin, and now I have translated them using more than an Author's licence, which obliges one to interpret, in order to adapt myself better to those who write in the vernacular.[53]

The Latin original was published in Salamanca in 1589 together with another six treatises by the Jesuit.[54] Chapter 23: "Quod falso multi Indos ex Iudaeorum genere descendere affirmant" covers pages 59–62 of the Salamancan edition and the content is the same as in the translation, since, in spite of what he says, in this case de Acosta had made a very literal translation. This Latin work went through several editions, but it was never as popular or as widespread as the *Historia Natural y Moral de las Indias*, which was translated into Italian in 1596, into French in 1597, into Dutch in 1598, into German in 1601, into Latin in 1602 and into English in 1604. The title of ch. 23 leaves us in no doubt as to De Acosta's opinion: "Que es falsa la opinion de muchos, que afirman, venir los Indios de el linaje de los Iudios."[55]

De Acosta begins by citing the text of 4 Ezra that provides the proof for those defending the Jewish origin of the American Indians:

> Since there was no way through the island of Atlantis for the Indians to cross to the new world, it seems to others that the route there must have been the one the Ezra writes in his fourth book, where he says as follows: And because you saw him, that he assembled to himself another peaceful multitude, you will know that these are the ten Tribes, who were taken into captivity in the time of King Hosea, whom Salmanassar, King of the Assyrians took captive, and he made them cross to the other side of the river and they were transferred to another land. They agreed among themselves

---

52 Ibid., 12.

53 Ibid., 10.

54 *De Natura Novi Orbis Libri Duo et de Promulgatione Evangelii apud Barbaros sive de procuranda Indorum Salute Libri Sex.* Autore Josepho Acosta, presbytero Societatis Iesu. Salmanticae. Apud Guillelmum Foquel, 1589.

55 *Historia Natural y Moral de las Indias*, 78.

> and determined to leave behind the multitude of the Gentiles and cross to another, more isolated region, where mankind had never lived, in order to observe at least the law which they had not kept in their own land. So they entered through some narrow entrances of the river until they had crossed. Because the way through that region was very long, a year and a half; and that region was called Arsareth. Then they lived there until the last times, and now when they begin to come, the Most High will return to hold back once again the streams of the river so that they can cross; for this I watched this multitude in peace.[56]

De Acosta continues with the arguments adduced by the proponents of this interpretation: the distance mentioned, the peaceful, prosperous and deceitful character of the Indians, their form of dress and footwear:

> Some wish to make this writing by Ezra fit the Indians, saying that they were taken by God (to) where mankind had never lived and that the land in which they reside is so isolated that it takes a year and a half to get there and that this people is peaceful by nature. The ordinary person holds that a clear indication that the Indians come from the line of the Jews, is that they are timorous, and weak, and very ceremonious, and sharp, and deceitful. Besides this they say that their dress seems typical of what Jews used, for they used a tunic or chemise, and on top (are) wrapped in a cloak, they wear no shoes, or their footwear is some soles sewn on the top, which they call *ojatas*. And that this had been the dress of the Hebrews, they say, which is the case from their stories and from ancient pictures, as they depict them dressed this way. And that these two forms of dress, which only the Indians wear, are those that Sampson wore, which the Scripture calls *tunicam et syndonem*, and is the same that Indians call chemise and cloak.[57]

---

[56] *Historia Natural y Moral de las Indias*, 78–79: "Ya que por la isla Atlantida no se abre camino, para pasar los Indios al nuevo mundo, pareceles a otros que devio de ser el camino, el que escribe Esdras en el quarto libro, donde dize assi: Y porque le viste, que recogia a si otra muchedumbre pacifica, sabras que estos son los diez Tribus, que fueron llevados en captiverio entiempo del Rey Osee, al qual llevò captivo Salmanassar Rey de los Asayrios, y a estos los passò a la otra parte del rio, y fueron trasladados a otra tierra. Ellos tuvieron entre si acuerdo, y determinacion de dexar la multitud de los Gentiles, y de passarse a otra region mas apartada, donde nunca habitò el genero humano, para guardar siquiera alli su ley, la qual no avian guardado en su tierra. Entraron pues, por unas entradas angostas del rio Eufrates: porque hizo el Altissimo entonces con ellos sus maravillas, y detuvo las corrientes del río, hasta que passassen. Porque por aquella region era el camino muy largo de año y medio: y llamase aquella region Arsareth. Entonces habitaron alli hasta el ultimo tiempo, y agora quando començaren a venir, tornarà el Altissimo a detener otra vez las corrientes del rio, para que puedan passar; por esso viste aquella muchedumbre con paz."

[57] *Historia Natural y Moral de las Indias*, 79: "Esta escritura de Esdras, quieren algunos acomodar a los Indios, diziendo, que fueron de Dios llevados, donde nunca habitò el genero humano, y que la tierra en que moran, es tan apartada, que tiene año y medio de camino para yr a ella, y que està gente es naturalmente pacifica. Que procedan los Indios de linage

He then moves on immediately to contradict these statements with his personal experience of the character, usages and customs of the Indians whom he knows directly: the Indians do not practise circumcision and unlike other Jews would have forgotten all their customs and beliefs; the character they are ascribed is not general—rather the Indians differ greatly from each other; and their dress and footwear are very natural and therefore common to many ancient peoples:

> But all these are very superficial conjectures, and they have much more against them than for them. We know that the Hebrews used letters; in the Indians there is no trace of them; the former were very fond of money, the latter pay it no attention. If the Jews were seen as uncircumcised, they would not be taken for Jews. In no circumstances do the Indians circumcise themselves, nor have they understood this ceremony, like many from Ethiopia and the east. But what relevance is it, the Jews being so keen to preserve their language and antiquity, so much that in all the parts of the world where they live today they differ from all the rest, and only in the Indies would they have forgotten their lineage, their law, their ceremonies, their Messiah and finally their Judaism as a whole? They say the Indians are timorous and superstitious and shrewd and deceitful; as for the first, this is not general for all of them; there are nations among these Barbarians who are quite alien to all this: there are nations of extremely brave and daring Indians, as there are other how are very dull-witted and simple. The Gentiles were always fond of ceremonies and superstitions. The cut of their clothes, the reason why he refers to it, is that it is the simplest and most natural in the world, with hardly any artifices, and the same was common in antiquity not only among the Hebrews but also among many other nations.[58]

---

de Iudios, el vulgo tiene por indicio cierto el ser medrosos, y descaydos, y muy ceremoniaticos, y agudos, y mentirosos. Demas desso dizen, que su habito parece, el propio que usaban Iudios, porque usan de una tunica o camiseta, y de un manto rodeado encima, traen los pies descalços, o su calçado es unas suelas asidas por arriba, que ellos llaman *ojatas*. Y que este aya sido el habito de los Hebreos, dizen, que consta assi por sus historias, como por pinturas antiguas, que los pintan vestidos en este traje. Y que estos dos vestidos, que solamente traen los indios, eran los que puso en apuesta Sanson, que la Escritura nombra *tunicam et syndonem*, y es lo mismo que los Indios dicen camiseta y manta."

[58] *Historia Natural y Moral de las Indias*, 79–80: "Mas todas estas son conjeturas muy livianas, y que tienen mucho mas contra si, que por sí. Sabemos, que los Hebreos usaron letras; en los indios no ay rastro dellas: los otros eran muy amigos del dinero, estos no se les da cosa. Los Iudios si se vieran no estar circuncidados, no se tuvieran por Iudios. Los Indios poco ni mucho no se retajan, ni han dado jamas en essa ceremonia, como muchos de los de Etiopia y del Oriente. Mas que tiene que ver, siendo los Iudios tan amigos de conservar su lengua y antiguedad, y tanto que en todas las partes del mundo que oy viven, se diferencian de todos los demas, que en solas las Indias a ellos no se les aya olvidado su linaje, su ley, sus ceremonias, su Mesias, y finalmente todo su Iudaysmo? Lo que dicen de ser los indios medrosos, y supersticiosos, y agudos y mentirosos, cuanto a lo primero, no es esso general a todos ellos, ay naciones entre estos Barbaros, muy agenas de todo

José de Acosta turns to the key text of 4 Ezra, concluding that it has no probative force at all as it is an apocryphal work, and if it were taken seriously, what it says contradicts exactly the opinion he contests, since the Indians are idolaters and warriors and it is impossible to understand how they could have reached America from the Euphrates. For de Acosta the analysis of the arguments for the possible Jewish origin of the Indians is as negative as their arrival through Atlantis:

> For the story of Ezra (if one should take notice of Apocryphal writings) contradicts rather than helps his purpose. For there it says that the ten Tribes fled the multitude of the Gentiles, to observe their ceremonies and law; but the Indians are given to all the Idolatries of the world. For the entrances of the river Euphrates, let them consider well those who think this, in what way could they reach the new world and let them see whether they have to take the Indians through there, as it says in the place mentioned. And I do not know why they have to call this people peaceful, the truth being that they persecute each other constantly with deadly wars? In conclusion, I do not see that the Apocryphal Euphrates of Ezra gives any better passage to the new world than would the fabled and enchanted Atlantis of Plato.[59]

The Franciscan Juan de Torquemada, who published *Los veinte y un libros rituales y monarchia Indiana con el origen y guerras de los indios occidentales, de sus poblaciones, descubrimientos, conquista, conversión y otras cosas maravillosas de la mesma tierra* in Seville in 1615, reaches the same conclusion.[60] Although this work goes slightly beyond the chrono

---

esso: ay naciones de Indios bravissimos y atrevidissimos, aylas muy botas y grosseras de ingenio. De ceremonias y supersticiones siempre los Gentiles fueron amigos. El traje de sus vestidos, la causa porque es el que se refiere, es, por ser el mas senzillo y natural del mundo, que a penas tiene artificio, y assi fue comun antiguamente no solo a Hebreos, sino a otras muchas naciones."

[59] *Historia Natural y Moral de las Indias*, 80: "Pues ya la historia de Esdras (si se ha de hazer caso de escrituras Apocrifas) mas contradize, que ayuda su intento. Porque allí se dize que los diez Tribus huyeron la multitud de Gentiles, por guardar sus ceremonias, y ley; mas los Indios son dados a todas las Idolatrias del mundo. Pues las entradas del rio Eufrates, vean bien los que esso sienten, en que manera pueden llegar al nuevo orbe y vean si han de tornar por allì los indios, como se dice en el lugar referido. Y no sé yo por qué se han de llamar estos gente pacifica, siendo verdad, que perpetuamente se han perseguido con guerras mortales unos a otros? En conclusión, no veo que el Eufrates Apocryfo de Esdras de mejor paso a los hombres para el nuevo orbe, que le dava la Atlantida encantada y fabulosa de Platon."

[60] *The twenty-one ritual books and the Indian monarchy with the origin and wars of the West Indies, about their peoples, discoveries, conquest, conversion and other marvellous things of the same land.* I am quoting from the second edition of 1723: *Primera Parte de los Veinte i un Libros Rituales i Monarchia Indiana con el origen y guerras delos Indios Occidentales, de sus Poblaciones, Descubrimiento, Conquista, Conversion y otras cosas maravillosas de la mesma tierra distribuidos en tres tomos.* Compuesto por F. Juan de Torquemada, Ministro

logical framework I set for myself, it is interesting to mention it because its author quotes literally (without mentioning their authors) both the work written by Doctor Roldán, and the refutation of his arguments by José de Acosta. Chapter 9 of the "Libro primero de los veinte y un rituales, y monarquia Indiana" has the title: "How the Peoples of these *West Indies* were not *Jews*, as some have tried to consider them, and their reasons contradict each other."[61] Juan de Torquemada repeats Doctor Roldán's arguments without acknowledgement since he thinks that they were devised by Las Casas:

> I found the reasons mentioned on a piece of Paper on which were written some clauses from the Testament of Brother Bartolomè de las Casas, who was bishop of Chiapa; and for this reason, and because they are in the same language, both of them, and in the same style which he kept to in all his writings, it seems to me that the opinion is his own; and if it is, I say in spite of his great authority and wisdom: I am not convinced that these Indians are from those Tribes he mentions.[62]

A comparison with the manuscript of Doctor Roldán makes it clear that Juan de Torquemada quotes him almost word for word,[63] so that his attribution to the Bishop of Chiapas is only meant to increase its authority and therefore the value of the refutation. It is certain that Bartolomé de las Casas attributes some authority to 4 Ezra, although he only cites chapter 6 without referring to chapter 13 or to the ten tribes. In his *Historia de las Indias*, he tells us that Columbus turned to the Catholic monarchs, relying on the authority of 4 Ezra:

> I am of the belief that this is the solid and enormous earth, which until now had been unknown, and reason helps me considerably because of this being a very large river and because of this sea, which is sweet, and then the saying

---

Provincial dela Orden de Nuestro Serafico Padre San Francisco en la Provincia del Santo Evangelio de Mexico en la Nueva Espana. En Madrid, en la Oficina y acosta de Nicolas Rodrigues Franco, Año 1723.

[61] *Primera Parte de los Veinte i un Libros Rituales*, fol. 22. "De como las Gentes de estas *Indias Occidentales*, no fueron *Iudíos*, como algunos han querido sentir de ellos, y se contradicen sus raçones."

[62] *Primera Parte de los Veinte i un Libros Rituales*, fol. 24: Estas raçones referidas, hallè en un Papel, donde estaban escritas unas clausulas del Testamento de Don Frai Bartolomè de las Casas, Obispo que fuè de Chiapa; y por esto, y por ser un mismo lenguaje, el uno que el otro, y el mismo estilo, que en todos sus escritos guardò, me parece que es suia la opinión; y si lo es, digo, que salva su mucha autoridad, y sabiduría: ne mo persuado a que estos Indios sean de aquellos Tribus que refiere.

[63] Gliozzi, *Adamo e il Nuovo Mundo*, 60: "Questa esposizione delle 'cinque ragioni' altro non è che una transcrizione pressoché letterale del manoscritto di Roldán."

> of Ezra helps me, which in book 4, chap. 6 states that the six parts of the world are of dry land and one (part) of water.[64]

Adding in this connection:

> Finally, although the book is apocryphal, which is as much as saying it is suspected of containing some mistakes, it does not follow that it does not have some and many truths, such as that of the last judgment and the *morietur filius meus Christus*. And so it could have been that from the same authority that the land is six times bigger than the sea, and for this reason one could very well quote it.[65]

Instead, Juan de Torquemada follows the opinion of José de Acosta, who considers the authority of the apocryphon to be relative, which also applies to the credibility of the itinerary of the ten tribes:

> Because, should it happen that the fourth book of Ezra were to be printed together with the other Canonical Books, it is not accepted by our Mother the Church as such, although it is admired as a good thing; and so it is considered an Apocryphon and uncertain, doubting whether or not it is his. Therefore I say that as there is doubt concerning the Book, there could also be doubt whether those ten Tribes, who remained in Babylon, made the Journey referred to there.[66]

The Franciscan, who like de Acosta, knows local traditions, criticises especially the miraculous crossing to which 4 Ezra alludes:

> For the entrances to the River Euphrates, let them consider those who think that way, in what way one could reach this new World, and let them see whether the Indians have to return there (as the passage cited from the Jews says, that they have to return there, to leave . . .). More than what

---

[64] Bartolomé de las Casas, *Historia de las Indias*, in *Obras escogidas* (BAE; Madrid: Real Academia Española 1957), 1:369: "Yo estoy creído que ésta es tierra firme, grandísima, de que hasta hoy no se ha sabido, y la razón me ayuda grandemente por esto deste tan grande río y desta mar, que es dulce, y después me ayuda el decir de Esdras, en el 4º libro, cap. 6, que dice que las seis partes del mundo son de tierra enjuta y la una de agua."

[65] *Obras escogidas*, 1:370: "Finalmente, aunque aquel libro sea apócrifo, que es tanto decir como sospechoso de contener algunos errores, no se sigue que no tenga algunas y muchas verdades, como es aquella del final juicio y aquella *morietur filius meus Christus*. Y así puede haber sido de la dicha autoridad que la tierra sea seis veces mayor que la mar, e por esta razón se puede muy bien en esto allegar."

[66] *Primera Parte de los Veinte i un Libros Rituales*, fol. 24: "porque dado caso, que el quarto libro de Esdras ande impreso, juntamente con los otros Libros Canonicos, no es rescibido de nuestra Madre la Iglesia por tal, aunque le admire, como cosa buena; y así es tenido por Apocrifo e incierto, dudando, en si es suyo, ò no. Por lo cual digo, que como ai duda en el Libro, la puede aver tambien, en si hicieron aquellos diez Tribus, que se quedaron en Babilonia, la Jornada que allí se refiere."

> the Mexicans say, though, that they crossed a branch of the Sea or a River, to come here, they do not say, whether its currents were held back, as the Jordan did, so that the Children of Israel could cross to the land of Promise; rather, that they crossed in the midst of its Waters, now Swimming, now on Rafts or Boats or anything at all, which could help them to cross: so that here the passage cited from Ezra is very little proof.[67]

And he closes his chapter with the categorical statement that the use of the authority of 4 Ezra as an argument not only does not prove the Jewish origin of the American Indians but in fact contradicts it:

> And so, I believe and I think that the passage from 4 Ezra cited not only does not prove the opinion but resolves it.[68]

Neither José de Acosta's opinion nor Juan de Torquemada's succeeded in putting an end to the exotic ideas spread by Doctor Durán and Gilbert Genebrard, and the polemic was to remain very much alive during the 17th century, both in Europe and in the Americas. However, although the authority of 4 Ezra would continue to be used as a proof, in fact it would have a less important role than the evidence of Montezinos disseminated by Menasseh Ben Israel.

---

[67] *Primera Parte de los Veinte i un Libros Rituales*, fol. 25: "Pues las intrados del Rio Eufrates, vean bien los que asi lo sienten, en què manera puede llegar a este nuevo Orbe, y vean si han de tornar por alli los Indios (como dice el lugar citado de los Judios, que han de volver, por alli, à salir . . . Demas de que aunque dice los Mexicanos, que pasaron un braço de Mar, or Rio, para venir por acà, no dicen, que se detuvieron sus corrientes, como hiço el Jordan, para que los Hijos de Israèl, pasasen a la tierra de Promision; sino, que pasaron, por medio de sus Aguas, ora fuese à Nado, ora en Balsas, ò Barcos, ò otra qualquier cosa, que pudiese servirles de paso: de manera, que por aquì mui poco prueba el lugar citado de Esdras."

[68] *Primera Parte de los Veinte i un Libros Rituales*, fol. 25: "y asi creo, y tengo para mi, que el lugar citado del Quarto Esdras, no solo no prueba la opinion, pero que se acuerda de ella."

SUBJECT INDEX

Abel
  dispute with Cain 113–18
  sister of 109–13
  as symbol of good 114
  as twin 107
Abraham
  (see Idolatry)
  (see Monotheism)
  cure of Pharaoh 136
  divine sonship of 93–95
  early life 3–16
  as first monotheist 3–16
  astronomer 8, 12
  inscribed on Heavenly Tablets 55
  progeny 93
  as recipient of revelation 11, 13, 119–21
Acosta, José de 182–89
d'Ailly, Pierre 160–4
Aqedah 63, 137, 144–45
American Indians
  customs compared to Israelites' 180, 184–86
  language 167, 169, 171, 179–81
  Jewish origin of 149 n. 3, 173 n. 3, 174–75, 179–80, 183–89
Angels
  (see Sodom and Gomorrah)
  (see Encounters with Divine Beings)
  circumcision of 21, 25, 28–29
  creation of 21–22
  fallen 18–20, 56, 106–7
  food of 23
  gender 17–30
  and human women 17–19, 104–5
  humans similar to 23–25, 85, 94, 107
  immortality 20
  physical appearance 22–23
  roles of 18, 21–22, 28–30, 96, 106, 112, 123–25
  as sons of God 83–85
  spiritualisation of 20–21, 23, 30
  as stars 19
Apocalypse of Abraham 9, 12–14
Authority
  (see Heavenly Tablets)
  (see Interpretation)
  of Abraham 7
  in determining calendar 60–64
  of 4 Ezra 150–57
  Interpreter of the Law 79–81, 89
  of Jubilees 43
  of Noah 45
  Teacher of Righteousness 80

Cain 65
  atheism of 116
  curse of 118
  dispute with Abel 113–18
  father of 19, 101–9, 111
  sister of 109–13
  as symbol of evil 19, 102, 114
  as twin 107
Canon
  (see Authority)
  (see 4 Ezra)
  (see Trent, Council of)
Circumcision 25–26, 66, 185
  (see Perfection)
  of angels 21, 25, 28–29
  destruction of uncircumcised 27, 92
  in Heavenly Tablets 27
  of Isaac and Ishmael 26, 144–46
  of Patriarchs 24–27, 121
Columbus, Christopher
  as fulfilling biblical prophecy 165
  reception of 4 Ezra 158–65, 188
Creation 158
  of angels 21–22
  demiurge 94, 96
  dispute over sequence of 21–22, 107
  of humans in image of angels 24–25
  in Philo 94
  Timaeus 94–95
  by YHWH alone 11

Damascus Document 52, 77, 81, 88
Divine Encounters
  Abraham 11, 13, 119–21
  angels 22–23, 59, 73, 121
  Enoch 18
  Ezra 174
  Hagar 140–41, 143
  Memra 23, 122, 137, 140, 144
  Moses 50

Divine Sonship 87–93
of Abraham 93–95
adoption 93–95
of angels 83–85
of cosmos 94–95
Greco-Roman conceptions of 93, 95
individual 86–87
of king 88–89
of Logos 94–97
messianic 90–92, 174
in Philo 93–97
at Qumran 83–92
tribal 85–88

Enochic Literature 17–19, 21, 25, 41, 50, 60, 68
Eschatology
(see Messiah)
(see Perfection)
future reward and punishment 56–58, 78–80, 88
resurrection 20
reunification of Israel 178–79
battle 35, 76–77, 85
world to come 127
Eve
daughters of 109–18
and Samael 19, 104–5
and serpent 101, 105–6, 108
Evil Figures
(see Cain)
Balaam 71–82
Belial 28, 75
demons 20, 106
evil spirits 9, 111
Lilith 20
Mastema 6–7
Samael 19–20, 104–9
serpent 101
4 Ezra
(see Columbus, Christopher)
canonicity of 151, 154–57, 164–65, 173, 180, 188
and Dead Sea Scrolls xvi
influence on Christian liturgy 153
reception by early Christians 150–52, 164
reception in Spain 150–57

Genesis Apocryphon 31, 44–48, 136–37
Genesis Rabbah 105–6, 111, 115–16, 125, 132–33
Geography
(see Land of Israel)
(see Montano, Arias)
and emergence of monotheism 13
in 4 Ezra 158, 161, 188
Garden of Eden 52
Ionian map 35, 47
in Josephus 34
in Jubilees 31–48
of New World compared to biblical 37–39, 166–71, 181–82
Spanish conceptions of 31, 161, 163
updating of biblical 31, 33–36
Gnosticism 102–3

Hagar 135–46
(see Ishmael)
as free(d)woman 138–39
as recipient of revelation 140–41, 143
as Pharaoh's daughter 136–37, 145
Sarah's anger at 138–39, 142
Halakah 64–68
(see Circumcision)
(see Heavenly Tablets)
(see Holidays)
childbirth impurity 52–53
Sabbath 29
temple regulations 4
Heavenly Tablets 51–69
(see Authority)
determination of calendar 60–64
halakah 27, 54, 64–68
as Oral Torah 69
predestination 56–59, 69
preexistence 27, 52–53, 69
as register of good and evil 54–56
as Torah of Moses 52–54, 69
Holidays
(see Heavenly Tablets)
memorial festivals 62
New Moon 62
New Year 62
Passover 61, 63–64
Feast of Weeks 61–62
Feast of Tabernacles 62–64

Idolatry
(see Ishmael)
(see Monotheism)
Abraham and 3–16, 137
American Indians and 180
polemic against 4–5, 8–9, 11, 14–15, 67
origins of 6–7
Illicit Sexual Relations
(see Sodom and Gomorrah)
(see Eve)
angels 17–19, 104–5
Balaam 71

Cain and Abel 112
Eve 101–9
intermarriage 67
Lot's daughters 57
Reuben 53
Interpretation
(see Geography)
(see Josephus)
(see Philo)
of ambiguous texts 64, 102–5, 110–11, 113, 119–21, 130–31
Heavenly Tablets as 69
Oral Torah as 69
paraphrase 13
omissions 30, 61, 104, 107, 110, 113, 115
supplementing of texts 13, 20, 74, 109, 136
updating of texts 31, 33–36
Ishmael
circumcision of 26–27, 144
dispute with Isaac 144–46
father of Arabs 142
as idolater 142–43, 145–46
illness of 143

Josephus
Biblical Antiquities 12–13, 34–35, 64
on Abraham 12–13
Jewish War 13
interpretation of biblical geography 34
scriptural paraphrases 13
Jubilees 6–7, 14, 21, 25, 27–29, 31–48, 51–69, 135

Land of Israel 28
rights to 40, 44–48
Letter of Aristeas 14
Logos
(see Philo)
as demiurge 94, 96
as high priest 97
as son of God 94–97

Messiah 58–59
as firstborn 90–91
multiple or single 76, 80–81
priestly 75
at Qumran 72, 75–82
royal 76, 81, 89–92
sceptre and star 74–82
Monotheism 3–16, 28
Abraham as inventor of 3–16
"biblical" 16
in Second Isaiah 4, 15–16
Maccabees 5
monolatry 4, 6, 8, 14–16
philosophical aspects 3, 5, 13–16
shema 3
two powers in heaven 113
Montano, Arias
(see 4 Ezra)
Antwerp Polyglot 36, 167
Phaleg 31–48, 167–71
Moses
angelic 85
as monotheist 14–15

Noah 62
angelic 25, 85
born circumcised 26
curse of Canaan/Ham 39, 44
division of land between sons 31–34, 39–45, 46–47
as Mosaic figure 40
Noahide covenant 65
sons of 26, 31–34, 37, 39–47, 167–68

Oral Torah
transmission of 69
Heavenly Tablets as 69
Other Gods 3, 9–10, 67, 84
(see Idolatry)

Perfection
of angels 20, 25, 30, 85
circumcision and 26–27
gender 20
immortality 20
of patriarchs 26–27
philosophical 12
at Qumran 30, 85, 88
role of Logos in 96
Pharisees 5, 61, 69, 113
Philo 53
on Abraham 12
on creation 94
on divine sonship 93–97
on Logos 95–97
Platonism 12, 14, 94–95
Pirqe Rabbi Eliezer 22, 26–27, 108, 112, 114, 124, 131
Platonism
(see Philo)
and creation 94–95
and monotheism 5
and biblical thought 12, 150
Prophets 4, 59, 142, 150, 164
false 71, 81

Rape of Dinah 26, 55–56, 67

Sadducees 20–21, 61, 69, 113
Sodom and Gomorrah
(see Illicit Sexual Relations)
angels at 123–26
descent of God to 130
Pelitit 130–33
sin of 126–30
"sodomy" 126
Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice 24, 84

Targum Neofiti 26, 35, 38, 103, 112, 114, 116–17, 121–25, 127, 130, 138–41
Targum Onqelos 103, 114, 130, 138
Targum Pseudo-Jonathan 19, 22, 67, 101, 104–18, 120–23, 125, 127, 129, 130–32, 135–46
Transgression
(see Idolatry)
(see Sodom and Gomorrah)
angels as cause of 6–7
first murder 118
of halakah 27–28
of Israel 5
serpent as cause of first 105
Trent, Council of 154, 157, 164, 173

Vulgate 66, 149–50, 155, 157, 169